PRICE 15c

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

1939 No. 6

England and France at the Crossroads

Changes in Bourgeois Nationalism

The International Significance of the Anti-Fascist Struggle in Germany

Political Mass Work in North China

The Flight From the Land in Germany

Fascist Agitation in the Near East

READY JULY

FIGHTING FOR PEACE

By EARL BROWDER

254 pages, price $.50

The fight for a positive peace policy which would penalize the aggressor and aid the victim of aggression, and which would collaborate with all other peace forces to halt the fascist war incendiaries, is today the central issue confronting the American people. The whole national security of the United States revolves around this issue.

In **Fighting for Peace**, Earl Browder develops, in brilliant style, a rounded-out program on the question of peace. His analysis of rhe alignment of forces on a world scale, the motives and interests, the position of the United States in relation to the Rome-Berlin-Tokio Axis, to the other so-called democratic powers, to the Soviet Union, and the national policy which he outlines for this country, provides an invaluable instrument for the further rallying of America's peace forces.

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York City

PUBLISHED MONTHLY IN ENGLISH, RUSSIAN, GERMAN, FRENCH, CHINESE AND SPANISH

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

ORGAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

VOL. XVI JUNE, 1939 No. 6

CONTENTS

Editorials

England and France at the Crossroads 451
The Struggle Between the Trends in the Socialist Party of France 458
People Without Room? 461
The "Historic Claims" of German Fascism 463

Theory and Practice of the Labor Movement

Changes in Bourgeois Nationalism . . . . P. WIEDEN . . 466
The International Significance of the Anti-Fascist Struggle in Germany . . . . . W. ULBRICHT . . 474
The Flight From the Land in Hitler Germany . . EDWIN HOERNLE . . 481
The Parliamentary Election in Finland . . . O. KUUSINEN . . 490
Political Mass Work and the Mass Organizations in North China . . . . . PEN DEH-HWAI . . 491
Fascist Agitation in the Near East . . . . D. DAVOS . . . 501

Book Reviews

"Democracy and Socialism" . . . . . P. DENGEL . . . 506

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, INC., P. O. Box 148, STATION D, NEW YORK CITY
Subscription price: one year $1.75; six months 90 cents. Single copies 15 cents

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

NEW PAMPHLETS

ON

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The 1940 Elections: How the People Can Win, by Earl Browder (new edition) 02

Your Questions Answered, by William Z. Foster 15

The Real Father Coughlin, by A. B. Magil 05

Railroads in Crisis 10
(Prepared by Labor Research Association)

From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union, by Joseph Stalin 05

The World Communist Movement, by D. Z. Manuilsky 10

The Soviet Union in 1942: The Third Five-Year Plan, by V. M. Molotov 15

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union: Report on Party Building by A. A. Zhdanov 15

Negro Slave Revolts in the United States 1526-1860, by Herbert Aptheker 15

Songs for America (words and music) 25

How the Rich Live, by Nan and Ernest Pendrell 05

Are We Aryans? by Gino Bardi 05

Communism, Science and Culture, by Jacques Duclos 15

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York City

England and France at the Crossroads

THE Munich Pact of the fascist aggressors and the ruling circles of England and France did not long hold out against the pressure of the contradictions between the German-Italian bloc and England and France. These contradictions are now very sharply expressed.

The Munich politicians in England now declare that Hitler did not discuss with them the complete annexation of Czechoslovakia and, through it, broke the Munich Pact. Hitler is again insisting on his unlimited right further to expand the "room to live" of fascist Germany, at the expense of Poland, Rumania and other countries and he demanded that the English and French governments do not in any way disturb his aims. As a retort to the declarations of England and France concerning the preservation of the inviolability of Poland and Rumania, he ostentatiously tore up the Anglo-German Naval Treaty and the non-aggression pact between Germany and Poland.

Italy occupied Albania and thus, in alliance with Germany, increased the threat against the colonial possessions of France and England. Apart from this, the fascist rulers of Germany and Italy, in order to buttress their bandit demands, also concluded an official military and political alliance, the point of which is openly directed against England and France.

The Munich game, played by the gentlemen of London and Paris, has gone completely awry. What was the object of this game? Long before the Munich Pact, the ruling circles in France and England abandoned the policy of collective security, of collective defense against aggressors and entered on the policy of non-intervention or benevolent "neutrality" towards the increasing boldness of fascist aggression. The conspiracy of Munich formed the peak of this policy of non-intervention. The true significance of this crafty policy was completely exposed by Comrade Stalin at the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.) He said:

"But actually speaking, the policy of non-intervention means conniving at aggression, giving free reign to war and, consequently, transforming the war into a world war. The policy of non-intervention reveals an eagerness, a desire, not to hinder the aggressors in their nefarious work, not to hinder Japan, say, from embroiling herself in a war with China, or, better still, with the Soviet Union; not to hinder Germany, say, from enmeshing herself in European affairs, from embroiling herself in a war with the Soviet Union; to allow all the belligerents to sink deeply into the mire of war, to encourage them surreptitiously in this; to allow them to weaken and exhaust one another; and then, when they have become weak enough, to appear on the scene with fresh strength, to appear, of course, 'in the interests of peace' and to dictate conditions to the enfeebled belligerents."*

That is what is behind non-intervention! But the old and cunning gamesters in London and Paris have lost the game this time. They gave the Sudeten region to Hitler as a payment in advance for his undertaking to begin the war against the Soviet Union. But Hitler, instead of fulfilling his engagement, not only appropriates the whole of Czechoslovakia but even violates the direct interests of England and France.

* Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, p. 13.

Obviously, German fascism would not be averse to breaking into the Soviet garden and it has not yet given up this idea. But none the less it is afraid of running its skull up against the steel-hard wall of the Soviet frontiers. And this fear is well-founded. Therefore, until now, fascist Germany and its aggression have gone the way of least resistance, for the time being, seeking out such victims as allow themselves to be betrayed and intimidated and are prepared to surrender, directing its pressure against the weak places in the spheres of influence of the western powers which it threatens with war.

Thus the English and French architects of Munich have not only been cheated but they have also steered their countries into an extremely difficult and dangerous situation. Consequently, in the face of direct danger of fascist aggression a decisive change has taken place in the public opinion of England and France.

Many who only yesterday were supporters of the Munich policy have now suddenly discovered convincing arguments for a policy of collective security and for the quickest possible realization of cooperation for mutual defense by the states interested in preserving peace. So long as these people believed that fascist aggression could be directed, not against the west but against the east, against the Soviet Union, they would not hear of a barrier against the unleashed forces of world war. On the contrary, they encouraged the Munich "peace-makers" who opened all the sluice-gates of fascist aggression.

It is only now that they are talking of the necessity of a peace front of nations, a barrier against fascism because they can see that the bloc of fascist aggressors, operating under the mask of the "Anti-Comintern Pact," has changed itself into a war alliance. Better late than never, certainly. But how costly this delay has been to the cause of peace! Let yesterday's supporters of the famous Munich Policy reflect on how many natural barriers against the fascist aggressors England and France have allowed the fascists to destroy in one year!

Such a barrier on the banks of the Danube was independent Austria. She has disappeared. England and France were bound by international treaties to defend the inviolability of Austria, but they allowed her to be mangled by German fascism. They allowed Austria to be turned into a base for the further expansion of fascist aggression.

In Southwest Europe on the other side of the Pyrenees, a firm barrier existed against fascist aggression—republican Spain, the Spain of the People's Front. The Spanish people fought long and heroically against the intervening armies of German and Italian fascism and their hired Spanish agents. As a member of the League of Nations, with full rights, republican Spain had the right to the support of England and France. But the ruling circles of England and France, under the mask of "non-intervention," secretly supported fascist aggression against Spain. And at the finish it was this assistance from England and France which led to the war ending in favor of the fascist aggressors. But now the fascist aggressors are turning Spain into a strategic base for an attack on France and her colonies as well as on English and French sea routes in the Mediterranean Sea.

In Central Europe, the foremost bastion of the western bourgeois democracies was the Czechoslovakian republic. This barrier against fascist aggression has now disappeared as well. It was the undeniable duty of France, on the basis of international treaties, to defend Czechoslovakia's sovereignty and independence. But the French government betrayed Czechoslovakia, although it knew that the Soviet Union, in accordance with the obligation it had assumed, was ready, if France defended Czechoslovakia, to hurry to the assistance of both countries. The English government acted as if it were restraining Hitler from annexing Czechoslovakia. In actual fact it was restraining the Czechoslovakian people in every possible way from defending its independence.

Thanks to this betrayal, the German "conquerors," without striking a single blow, gained possession of the fortified

Czechoslovakian "Maginot Line" and later of the whole country, primarily in order to seize its great war industries and its war equipment. It was not without justification that Hitler boasted, in his last Reichstag speech on April 28, 1939, about the rich war booty he had secured in Czechoslovakia—complete equipment for from thirty-five to forty divisions. This is the gift made to the chief fascist aggressor in Europe by Chamberlain and Daladier.

In spite of the worsening of the international situation through the results of the policy of the aggressor states on the one hand and the policy of "non-intervention" of the non-aggressor states on the other hand, the representatives of the reactionary bourgeoisie in England, France and other countries seek to calm the people with empty speeches. At the session of the Supreme Soviet, Comrade Molotov established that:

"The representatives of the democratic countries which have turned their backs on a policy of collective security and have pursued a policy of non-resistance to aggression are trying to belittle the significance of the change for the worse that has taken place in the international situation. They still continue to occupy themselves mainly with 'soothing' public opinion, pretending that nothing essential has occurred recently.

"The position of the Soviet Union in the appraisal of current events in international life differs from the position of both these parties. It cannot, as everybody understands, be in any way suspected of any sympathy for the aggressors. It is likewise averse to glossing over the change for the worse that has really taken place in the international situation. It is clear to us that attempts to conceal from public opinion the actual changes that have taken place in the international situation must be countered by the facts. It will then be obvious that the 'soothing' speeches and articles are only needed by those who have no desire to prevent the further development of aggression, in the hope of directing aggression, so to speak, in a more or less 'acceptable' channel."

The increase of fascist aggression has caused great agitation among the masses in England and France and has made them determined to resist the aggressors once and for all and to bring about a change in the policy of the French and English governments. And, above all, to push through cooperation of both these countries with the great Soviet Union in order to hold the fascist warmongers in check. No public demand in England or France has been so continuously and so generally raised as that of an immediate cooperation with the Soviet Union.

"Without the participation of the Soviet Union, no system of collective security is possible," is the daily cry of the English press and of the English Parliament. Even those people who did not speak with any friendship at all for the Soviet Union and who a short time ago talked about "complete isolation of the Soviet Union," now say and write: "The country unmistakably demands an alliance with the Soviet Union. The country must achieve an alliance with the Soviet Union. Only this can scare off Hitler."

Therefore it is not surprising that the English and French governments issued statements about a "change," about a "new direction" of their foreign policy. They issued a series of declarations against any further development of fascist aggression in Europe and promised guarantees to Poland, Rumania and Greece. England concluded a treaty with Turkey. But that did not quiet public opinion in England and France. In the English Parliament Lloyd George roundly declared that without the Soviet Union the British guarantees to Poland, Rumania and Greece are the most frivolous undertakings ever made by any country. He went on to say that the British government needs the Soviet Union but does not desire her support, and therefore that it is faced with the alternative either of encountering certain defeat or of not fulfilling its obligations, which is what had been done up to the present.

But the Ministers did not allow themselves to become embarrassed. The pro-fascist politicians who a short time ago were striving to turn fascist aggression "towards the East" now masqueraded as honest supporters of cooperation with the Soviet Union. Under the pressure of

public opinion the British government opened negotiations with the government of the Soviet Union on the question of organizing a peace front.

The position of the Soviet Union was clear, as always. It was as follows:

"The U.S.S.R. was and is of the opinion that if France and Great Britain really want to erect a barrier against aggression in Europe, a united front of mutual assistance should be set up for this end; first of all, between the four great powers in Europe—England, France, U.S.S.R. and Poland—or at least of the three powers, England, France and the U.S.S.R. and that these three powers, united by a pact of assistance based on reciprocity, should give guarantees to the other states of Eastern and Central Europe which are threatened by aggression."*

That is a position of a logical and consistent peace policy! However, it appeared that this attitude of the Soviet Union did not correspond to the intentions of the English and French governments. It became apparent that even *after* the "new" course had been announced, these governments had no desire to pursue a consistent, or even a simply honest peace policy.

In his speech, mentioned above, Comrade Molotov pointed out that in the policy of the non-aggressive states "certain changes" were taking place "in the direction of resistance to aggression." To this he added:

"How serious these changes are still remains to be seen. As yet it cannot be said whether these countries are seriously desirous of abandoning the policy of non-intervention, the policy of non-resistance to the further development of aggression. . . . We must therefore be vigilant."

How urgently necessary is this vigilance can already be seen from the manner in which the English and French Ministers started and carried out negotiations with the Soviet Union.

The negotiations dragged on but the Ministers avoided giving answers to the questions: "why, where and what are the differences of opinion?" asked by the uneasy Members of Parliament and journalists. Instead, there appeared in the bourgeois press all kinds of slanderous inventions about the attitude of the Soviet Union. One got the impression that someone was deliberately trying to prepare public opinion for a breakdown of the negotiations and to put all the blame on the Soviet Union, which was credited with the most stupid demands.

Then there appeared the announcement, in London, of *counter-proposals* made by England, in full agreement with France, to the Soviet Union. But the obviously-inspired communication made by the English news agency reproduced the contents of these suggestions quite incorrectly. As it later became clear, the English government, in its suggestions, *evaded* completely the question of a *reciprocal guarantee of assistance* between England, France and the Soviet Union. It suggested that the Soviet Union undertake immediately to give help to England and France in the event of these countries becoming involved in a war in consequence of their fulfilling their obligations to Poland and Rumania, but it *remained quite silent* on the subject of the help:

". . . which the Soviet Union, on the basis of the reciprocal principle, should naturally receive from France and England if she should be involved in hostilities in fulfilling the obligations guaranteed to this or that state in Eastern Europe."*

Apart from this the English government took the position that the practical resistance to aggression and the moment of beginning this resistance must be decided by the English and French governments independent of the Soviet Union.

In short, the substance of the English counter-proposals was: If the fascist aggression is directed against England, France and Poland, then the Soviet Union must assist all these states without, in turn, receiving help from any of them; on the other hand if fascist aggression takes place directly against the

* *Izvestia*, May 11, 1939.

* *Ibid.*

Soviet Union, then the Soviet Union must rely on its own forces alone.

Those are the suggestions for cooperation with the Soviet Union, concocted by the governing circles of England and France. Did they not know that the Soviet Union would reject such proposals? If they thought that these proposals would be accepted, then the authors of these proposals had neglected entirely to bear in mind what Comrade Stalin said at the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.). Speaking of the tasks of the Party in the sphere of foreign policy, Comrade Stalin described one of the tasks as follows:

"To be cautious and not allow our country to be drawn into conflicts by warmongers who are accustomed to have others pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them."*

No wonder the authors of the English counter-proposals were chary of informing English public opinion as to the content of these suggestions. In order to soothe public opinion, which was demanding honest cooperation with the Soviet Union on the basis of reciprocity, they attempted to deceive the English people by means of the Reuter Agency. This official agency released a canard to the effect that in the counter-proposals, England would undertake to come to the help of the Soviet Union if she became involved in a war as a result of fulfilling her guarantees to neighboring states.

When it was discovered, through the TASS reports, that nothing like that was contained in the English proposals, and when the Members of Parliament began to bombard Chamberlain with questions, he talked about "misunderstandings" and assured them that the English government had "never entertained the idea of asking anything from the U.S.S.R. which it was unwilling to undertake itself."

That's all right then, they answered, why don't you conclude the agreement with the Soviet Union on the basis of reciprocity, then? Oh no! he replied that is a "great and delicate question," "we are continuing the negotiations, but there are difficulties." But what these difficulties are, he would not say.

Chamberlain makes mysterious allusions in Parliament, that "other states" do not wish for cooperation between England and the Soviet Union, that complications might occur. What states these are he will not disclose. Naturally, he would not like to say straight out that it is the *fascist* states, the three aggressors of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo triangle and their vassals. It goes without saying that the fascist aggressors and their vassals "do not desire" the setting up of a barrier against the fascist aggressors and least of all the establishment of cooperation of England and France with the great Soviet Union. But if the English and French Ministers are going to continue considering the wishes of the fascist aggressors and their agents, why do they talk about a "new" policy, about resistance to any further extension of fascist aggression?

The English and French Ministers are trying to persuade the people that the negotiations with the Soviet Union have been delayed by "misunderstandings" and other secret difficulties. But in his speech, Comrade Molotov stated quite clearly and concisely what minimum conditions were held by the Soviet Union to be indispensable before realizing a peace front capable of action. He stated:

"In connection with the proposals made to us by the British and French governments, the Soviet government entered into negotiations with them regarding measures necessary for combatting aggression. This was in the middle of April. The negotiations begun then have not yet ended. But even at that time it was apparent that if there was a real desire to create an effective front of the peaceable countries against the advance of aggression the following minimum conditions were necessary: that an effective pact of mutual assistance against aggression, a pact of an exclusively defensive character, be concluded between Great Britain, France and the U.S.S.R.; that a guarantee against attack by aggressors be extended by Great

---

* Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, pp. 17-18.

Britain, France and the U.S.S.R. to the states of Central and Eastern Europe, including all European countries bordering on the U.S.S.R., without exception; that a concrete agreement be concluded by Great Britain, France and the U.S.S.R. regarding the forms and extent of the immediate and effective assistance to be given to each other and to the guaranteed states in the event of attack by aggressors.

"Such is our opinion, an opinion we force upon no one but to which we adhere. We do not demand the acceptance of our point of view, and we do not ask anybody to do so. We consider, however, that this point of view really answers the interests of security of the peaceable states."

These words admit of no "misunderstandings." And no one who really desires to defend peace will consider it "difficult" to accept these suggestions of the Soviet Union without reservation. The "difficulties" consist entirely in the fact that certain pro-fascist politicians are still not ready to fulfil the people's demand for an active peace front. It is quite clear that certain pro-fascist politicians in London and Paris would like to continue the old Munich policy in one form or another. Instead of the determined process of bridling the fascist aggressors and ensuring general peace, they would like to do business with the fascist aggressors at the expense of other states. Instead of establishing real cooperation with the Soviet Union in the interests of the safety of the nations which are threatened by fascism, they would like to exploit the fact of the protracted negotiations with the powerful Soviet Union only to gain more favorable conditions for English and French imperialism with the fascist governments. Instead of fulfilling the public demand for the conclusion of a pact on a reciprocal basis with the U.S.S.R. against the fascist aggressors, they pretend that they are trying to come to an agreement with the U.S.S.R.; they would like to satisfy public opinion in their countries with empty promises. But if these things depended on the wishes of these pro-fascist politicians, then it would be an evil day for the peoples of the world—for the English and French people too.

However, what the pro-fascist politicians *would like* to do and what they *are able* to do are two different things.

They would like the Soviet people to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them, but the Soviet Union will not do this for them. They would like to barter away the vital interests of their own and other peoples, but the peoples have no intention of allowing themselves to be sacrificed. They would like, by working behind the scenes, to eliminate, or at all events to lessen, the imperialist contradictions between England and France, on the one hand, and Germany, Italy and Japan, on the other hand, but the result is only an increase of the contradictions and a growing danger of world war. And the reason why contradictions are being intensified and why the danger of war increases lies in the fact that the pro-fascist politicians sabotage the creation of a real barrier to fascist aggression and a united front of the nations for the defense of their national independence and of world peace.

Notwithstanding the fact that for the fascists world war means the threat of complete catastrophe, in the first place because, in this war, they would have to be answerable to their own peoples, each day they fan the fires of war. But the pro-fascist politicians of England and France, although they have reason to fear war, continue to oppose the international peace front, without which it is not possible to restrain the fascist aggressors, to prevent a world war.

The pro-fascist politicians of England and France are afraid that the establishment of real cooperation with the Soviet Union, in order to bridle fascist aggression, would have too great an effect on the situation of fascism in Germany, Italy and the other countries, that the capitulation of the fascist aggressors, which would be a result of this, would shake the already insecure fascist regime to its foundations, strengthen the struggle of the masses against the fascist hangmen and call to the scene the forces of democratic revolution.

All this might very easily happen, yet,

in the event of a world war, the revolution would break out still more quickly. No one can hold back for long the roaring freshet of revolution which rages beneath the ice-sheet of the fascist dictatorship in Germany, Italy and Japan. And if the English and French pro-fascist politicians prefer a pact of mutual assistance of fascism and reaction against the forces of democracy and progress to a pact of mutual assistance against fascist aggression and war, the people of England and France will certainly refuse to agree to this.

In the last analysis, the direction of English and French policy, which is so important for the future development of international events, depends on the *people* of England and France. The present zigzag course of the pro-fascist ruling circles of England and France cannot be regarded as the final course of English and French policy. The masses in England and France *do not agree* with the perilous game of the Munich politicians. The exposure of this playing with fire has already put public opinion in these countries on the alert and has compelled the governments for a time to abandon the policy of direct encouragement to the unbridled fascist aggressors.

The English and French governments were compelled to take a hesitant step forward. But if the people are not vigilant it is by no means impossible that they will experience a second Munich. Comrade Molotov described this "step forward" in these words:

"The other day new British and French proposals were received. In these proposals the principle of mutual assistance between Great Britain, France and the U.S.S.R on the basis of reciprocity in the event of direct attack by aggressors is now recognized. This, of course, is a step forward, although it should be noted that it is hedged around by such reservations—even to the extent of a reservation regarding certain clauses in the League of Nations Covenant—that it may prove to be a fictitious step forward. As regards the question of guaranteeing the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, on this point the proposals mentioned show no progress whatever from the standpoint of reciprocity. They provide for assistance being given by the U.S.S.R. to the five countries which the British and French have already promised to guarantee, but say nothing about their giving assistance to the three countries on the Northwestern frontier of the U.S.S.R., which may prove unable to defend their neutrality in the event of an attack by aggressors. But the Soviet Union cannot undertake commitments in regard to the five countries mentioned unless it receives a guarantee in regard to the three countries on its Northwestern frontier.

"That is how matters stand regarding the negotiations with Great Britain and France."

Only if broad public opinion grasps the situation more clearly politically and the struggle of the masses, and primarily of the workers, for the abandonment of the old treacherous and pro-fascist policy is increased, can there be achieved a real change in English and French foreign policy for the establishment of international cooperation of England and France with the strong bulwark of peace, the mighty socialist state for the energetic restriction of the fascist aggressors.

England and France stand at the crossroads. It is the *working class* of these countries, above all, which is conscious of the enormous responsibility which has fallen to its lot, which faces a great task—to determinedly take over that leading role which has been given it, by the present struggle of the whole people, for a new direction in the policy of England and France and for the creation of a wall of international protection against fascism and war.

The Struggle Between the Trends in the Socialist Party of France

AT THE Congress of the French Socialist Party held in December, 1938, in Montrouge, a three-fifth majority declared against the fatal policy of capitulation to fascism and against the Munich Pact which only a few weeks before had been approved by the entire parliamentary fraction of the Socialist Party (except for one deputy).

In the last six months, which, after the betrayal of the Spanish republic, have been characterized by new onslaughts of the fascist aggressors and by a more and more reactionary internal policy of the Daladier-Bonnet-Reynaud government, it is evident from the discussion inside the Socialist Party that the process of political clarification has made further progress among the mass of the party membership. The repeated bitter lessons of past events, on the one hand, the untiring struggle of the Communist Party against war and fascism, against the Munich policy and for the strengthening of the People's Front, on the other, have brought many Socialist workers closer to the standpoint of the Communist Party. This is seen in the strengthening of fraternal relations between Socialist and Communist workers in the lower organizations.

But the more the Socialist workers turn towards a correct policy corresponding to the interests of the working class, the greater is the resistance that certain leaders of the Socialist Party oppose to unity in action on the part of the proletariat.

The resolutions and the discussion in preparation for the Congress of Nantes revealed the changes inside the Socialist Party.

On the one hand, the majority resolution shows a more correct comprehension of the situation, although as regards conclusions, especially in the question of the united front, it still makes important reservations. On the other hand, the Paul Faure trend, which continues to defend the Munich policy, reveals its intention of employing all means, including even a split, in order to force on the Socialist Party a policy in contradiction to the interests of the working class and one which puts the party wholly in tow to the reactionary French bourgeoisie which is linked with fascism. Moreover, since the Montrouge Congress it has been possible to detect a kind of "ideological" approximation between Paul Faure and all the dubious elements, the remnants of the Trotskyite groupings that have been expelled from the Party and the various other provocateur elements, all of which revolve round him, and this also finds expression in the resolutions.

The "Paul Faure resolution" continues to defend the Munich policy and attempts to lay the responsibility for the aggression of the fascist dictators on the democratic forces. It is especially noticeable that this resolution openly borrows from the fascist mode of expression and fascist "ideology." It speaks of "measures for a redivision of raw materials," and of a "solution of the problem of overpopulation," without indicating how

this is to happen, and without in the slightest degree marking itself off from the fascist demands that are formulated in a similar way.

Further, it speak of "economic collaboration" (obviously on the model of the "collaboration" between Czechoslovakia and Germany, Austria and Germany or Albania and Italy). Finally it justifies in advance the fascist acts of aggression which are being prepared by declaring that measures which "would bring about the collapse of the totalitarian states" could "force the dictators into war." With this shameless defense of the fascist aggressors, Paul Faure suppresses even the fact that there are two classes in the totalitarian states; he makes no distinction between the capitalist class which would suffer "economic collapse" and the working class which could thereby free itself from its chains and put in question the war plans of the dictators.

The "Paul Faure resolution" is also characterized by what it does not contain. The resolution does not speak of the Soviet Union, nor of the necessity of forming a peace bloc of the non-aggressive states together with the Soviet Union. It expresses itself with intentional ambiguity on the question of unity in action and the People's Front. It passes over in silence the danger of fascism inside the country.

The resolution of the friends of the Trotskyite Pivert who have remained within the Socialist Party supplements the Paul Faure resolution with even greater cynicism. It discovers in Hitler's speech of April 28 the basis for a "discussion" with the fascists, it turns the acts of aggression of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo axis against China, Spain, Czechoslovakia, Austria and Albania into "imperialist conflict between two antagonistic blocs," it repeats the fascist assertions of the alleged "anti-capitalist" character of the fascist dictatorship, it grants Hitler that the predominance of Germany in Southeast Europe is "inevitable," and it declares in general that it desires to meet fascism with "objectivity"! So that is what the Trotskyites understand by the "restoration" of socialism!

There were still other resolutions, like that of the so-called "integral pacifists," which were nothing but a mass of provocatory nonsense. Moreover, this leaves out of account the inextricable medley of resolutions, amendments, proposals and counter-proposals, which stood for a "reconciliation," a "synthesis," etc., and which, in view of the concern of honest Socialists for the unity of the party, had as their sole object the conscious multiplication of confusion and prevention of the necessary clarity.

The enemies of the working class and democracy did not fail to encourage Paul Faure and his followers. Déat, that mysterious character, who only shortly before had been congratulated by Goebbels for his campaign on the Danzig question, was kind enough to give the Socialist Party his "well-thought-out" advice (well-thought-out by the fascists): Follow pacifism, he advised, that is "the natural path that Socialism must follow." Paul Faure-Déat-Goebbels, these names represent a whole program.

Many active members of the party have pointed out the danger in store for the party through such a policy, and they express their pain because their party "now no longer plays the role that it should play in the country." This is the more dangerous since at the present time reaction is making certain progress, as can be seen from some of the latest election results.

One cannot, however, pass over in silence the fact that the work of disintegration in the Socialist Party carried out by the Hitler-Trotskyite agents is also facilitated because the great and growing efforts of the masses for unity nist Party do not find the necessary echo even among the leaders of the Socialist majority. It is undoubtedly a sign of progress that Blum in his resolution emphasizes the necessity "to awaken among the masses of the people that spirit of resistance to injustice and oppression, which is one of the constituent parts of Socialism," or that he brands fascism as

"the direct and immediate cause of war through which Europe is becoming more and more menaced," and notes that today the fascist dictators are "the only possible aggressors."

It should not be forgotten, however, that unity of action with the Communist Party, which has long been fighting for such a collaboration of forces, the unity that is being so resolutely demanded by a large section of the Socialist workers, has in recent months been silently shelved by the Socialist Party leaders. Even Blum's resolution shows little warmth towards unity of action.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party met a few days before the Socialist Congress at Nantes. What a contrast between these two meetings! While the enemies of the working class succeeded in introducing confusion into the midst of the Socialist Party and to evoke hair-splitting and confusing discussions on the statutes and resolutions, in order to frustrate a real political discussion of the great problems facing the proletariat, the Central Committee of the Communist Party, on the other hand, on the basis of a clear analysis of the situation and its development, showed the way forward and voiced the slogans which are capable of bringing about the unity of the working class and all democratic forces in France and its victory over fascism. Fully conscious of the role and responsibility of the working class in the entire political development of France, as well as of the important role that France plays in the world-wide struggle for victory over fascism, Maurice Thorez addressed his appeal to Leon Blum:

"Comrade Leon Blum, the fate of the working class depends in a great measure upon you; the return to effective practice of common action depends above all on you."

May this appeal be heard, may the Socialist Party have the same faith as the Communist Party in the masses, in the "ardor of the masses of the people, the first prerequisite for success."

People Without Room?

IN THOUSANDS of publications, pamphlets, articles and speeches the German fascists have broadcast the thesis that the German people is a "people without room." Again and again they have tried to substantiate their demand for colonies, their "right to conquests" by the argument that Germany is too densely populated, that the German people needs room for colonizing, that the German people needs new colonial space.

In his Reichstag speech of April 28, this year, Hitler declared that the President of the United States of America has "a much easier job" because America is not so thickly populated as Germany; he appealed to him demagogically:

"You have the good fortune to have only fifteen people per square kilometer of your country to feed. . . . By the extent of your space and the fertility of your fields you can ensure for each American ten times the supplies that is possible in Germany. Nature has at any rate given you this possibility. Although the number of inhabitants of your country is scarcely a third more than the number of inhabitants of Greater Germany, you have more than fifteen times as much space for living at your disposal."

Germany, therefore, if we are to take the words of her "Fuehrer" seriously, has too many inhabitants and must endeavor to get rid of part of them. One can therefore understand the astonishment of the Germans when, a few days later, the *Voelkischer Beobachter* faced them with the proposition that they are not a "people without room" at all, but Germany is a "room without people." Thousands of times they have been told that Germany suffers from over-population, and suddenly the *Voelkischer Beobachter* announces the opposite. In a leading article of May 4, 1939, we read:

"It is our task to raise the number of the population until by itself it is worthy of the new political importance of the Reich."

The author of this staggering leading article, the very authoritative Dr. Fritz Nonnenbruch, tries to convince his readers with a drastic picture. He writes:

"If the present position of the Reich is compared with a shoe, and its figure of population with a foot, then the foot is now too small for the shoe. We must in the course of time decide either that the shoe fits the foot and becomes smaller, or that the foot grows."

Up to now the German fascists have ceaselessly lamented that the shoe is too small and so pinches the foot; the shoe, Germany, must be enlarged so that the German people can live on a grand scale. German fascism tanned the Austrians and Czechs so as to cobble a larger shoe —and now it is suddenly discovered that the shoe has got too big, and the foot must quickly expand in the new "living room." While Hitler told the President of the United States of America that the German people has too little "space for living," Nonnenbruch assures the German people that it must grow so as to fit the "space for living" which has grown too large. While Hitler, in the name of "surplus population" demands colonies, Nonnenbruch bemoans a "deficit in population" and orders German men and women to finish with liberalism in their marital life and to enter on a "production campaign" in this sphere too. He threatens and bullies like a sergeant major in a militarily regimented eroticism:

"We have rooted out liberalism on the entire front. It has not been rooted out in the most dangerous corner; that is the inadequate desire for children. . . ."

We will not go too closely into this "most dangerous corner of liberalism" and would rather withdraw with Nonnenbruch from this part of the front to the rear of Berchtesgaden where there is an adequate desire for children—of course for the children of others.

"The fact that the growth of the population figures lags behind the results aimed at by the National-Socialist leadership is a sign that the people are not on the same plane with its leadership. . . ."

It is the essence of this leadership that it demands from others what it does not do itself. This leadership, which is alien to everything human, demands from the people that it should treat the most intimate attribute with the same cold bloodedness that it produces cannon and the conflagration of war. The leadership supplies the war and the people are to supply the men—that is the division of labor in Hitler Germany. The leadership supplies a shoe which is so large that the foot slips about in it and the people must take care of the future generation for whom there is not enough milk and butter but who may look to a future where the unfilled "living room" turns into an overfilled grave.

In order to get this rapid "growth in the population figures" and to root out liberalism in the "most dangerous corner," the Mayor of Wattensheid in the Ruhr district has taken some measures which the "Black Corps" recommends should be imitated. This fascist population politician promises all unmarried women a premium of 500 marks for every "successful creative act" and informs them that the municipal authorities will put men at their disposal who "by their physical and racial characteristics are fitted for mating." Zoology triumphs over the humanities. Women and men become thoroughbreds who are coupled for mating and after a "successful creative act" are given premiums. Man in Hitler Germany counts as an adjunct to an imperialist "living room" which must be filled—with war factories, with fortifications, and with beasts of burden. Love life is a part of the fascist war economy like coal-mining; for the one as for the other there is but one order—"higher output."

In view of the wild contradiction between the watchword "people without room" and the watchword "growth in the number of the population," even the best intentioned must realize with what shamelessness German fascism is deceiving them. Instead of "growing" into that shoe of Greater Germany, which even according to the confession of the German fascists themselves has grown too large, and making themselves sore and bleeding by walking in it, the German people should realize that the foot is neither too large nor too small to deal the fascist deceivers a powerful kick.

The "Historic Claims" of German Fascism

GERMAN fascism has found a so-called "new method" of preparing and justifying the subjugation by force of foreign countries and the enslavement of foreign peoples. This "new method" consists in harping continually on the so-called "historic claims" of Germany. How far Germany's "historic claims" reach back is not clearly stated either in the Fuehrer's speeches or in the fascist literature and press. It is, however, clear that the German fascists always trace back their particular "historic claims" to a foreign territory exactly to the time when it was under German sovereignty or belonged to Germany, whether this was one thousand, one hundred or twenty years ago.

It also happens that the fascists base their "historic claims" on German efforts at colonization, that in times long past took place somewhere in the world. Treaties honestly concluded between individual nations are, however, not recognized in any way as legal by the German fascists.

To reinforce their so-called "historic claims" the fascists make all sorts of lying assertions. For example, it was asserted that the Austrians were part of the German nation, because they speak German, and that the Austrian state, because it was not self supporting and because it lacked vital power, would have to founder or be united to Germany; that the Sudeten territory was ancient German land, and that the population there wished "to return home to the Reich"; that the Czechoslovakian state belonged to the Holy Roman Empire and must therefore fall to Germany.

Concerning the Baltic states, over which an ever increasing fight is being waged, it is said that they were conquered seven hundred years ago by German knighthood and simply for that reason must belong to Germany. Even in the Polish question Hitler has continually stressed his "historic claims."

"Danzig is a German town," bellows Hitler to the world and in so doing he forgets that since its foundation until 1308 Danzig belonged to Poland. In 1308 Danzig fell to German knighthood; in 1350 it came into the Hansa federation. In 1454 Danzig once more became a Polish town and remained so until 1793 when Poland was partitioned. From 1793 until 1807 Danzig was Prussian; from 1807 until 1813 it was occupied by the French, and from 1814 until 1920 it again belonged to the Prussians. In 1920 Danzig became a free city. The town has now existed for more than seven hundred years and has only belonged to Germany for about one hundred and sixty years of this time.

That, however, did not in any way prevent Hitler from insisting on his "historic claims" even in the Danzig question and declaring that the Danzig question must "quite naturally be solved sooner or later," and indeed "not according to any old scheme but in a new way." This "new way" of Hitler consisted in putting the demand to Poland in his last Reichstag speech: "Danzig returns to the framework of the German Reich as a free town." The propaganda minister Goebbels seconded Hitler. On May 13 he wrote in the *Voelkischer Beobachter:* "Danzig can point to an overwhelming majority of German population. That is the starting point."

And how did the matter stand with Czechoslovakia, Herr Goebbels? After all Czechoslovakia could undoubtedly point to an overwhelming majority of

Czech population, but nevertheless the German fascists referred to their so-called "historic claims" and certainly did not renounce their claims to Czechoslovakia just because a majority of the population were Czechs and not Germans.

The demand on Poland is only a continuation of that policy expounded by Hitler in his book *Mein Kampf* and in his speeches to the public. Thus in October, 1930, he declared:

"We need one million square kilometers, which we can only find in the east. I shall have no pity for the Poles whom I shall put to flight. Let them settle down in Siberia if they wish."

These "historic claims," backed up by threats, at first exercised a certain influence on the masses. Meanwhile, however, this "new method" has become all too threadbare; the peoples are beginning to see through this perforated fabric and to recognize the true intentions of the German fascists. They realize that Hitler is not only concerned about Danzig and about a street and a railway line through the corridor but that he wishes to encircle and subjugate Poland, because he requires it for his imperialist claims of conquest in the east. The Polish nation has also understood the real intentions of Hitler and is beginning to oppose them. The Polish press has already spoken of "German imperialist expansion in Europe" and Herr Goebbels who examines this characterization of fascist Germany by the Polish press, does not deny it but on the contrary defends it.

The language of the fascist gentlemen becomes clearer and clearer. The contradictions become more and more obvious. The territorial claims on Austria and the Sudetenland took place under the pretext of bringing "the German brothers abroad" back "home into the Reich." Today the fascist press and Herr Goebbels themselves openly admit that German annexation is bound up with "German imperialist expansion." There is no other issue in the Danzig question and the corridor question or, to speak more clearly, the Polish question.

The Polish press, which sees through Hitler's intentions, has turned the tables and now on the part of Poland brings up no less wordy "historic claims" to German territory. It declares Danzig to be a Polish town; it asserts that East Prussia is most strongly bound historically, geographically and economically to Poland and must return to Poland. It puts forward the "historic claims" of Poland to Schleswig and—historically considered—it can show that its "historic claims" are based on older "rights."

Until the middle of the twelfth century, the Baltic states belonged to Poland. During the time of German knighthood many fights were waged over these territories. At the battle of Tannenberg in 1410 German knighthood suffered heavy defeat, and at the Peace Treaty of Thorn in 1466 the whole of West Prussia, together with Marienburg, Thorn, Danzig, Elbing and Kulm, fell to Poland. Ludwig von Ehrlichshausen had to swear the oath of fidelity on behalf of East Prussia to the Polish King Kasimir IV. Only after the three divisions of Poland in 1772, 1793 and 1795 did the Baltic states come to Prussia.

If today the Polish press puts forward its "historic claims," it is only doing what the German press has done for years. However, it is something new to the German fascists to find that someone dares to turn against them the methods they discovered. The "historic claims" of Poland have put the German press and also the propaganda minister Goebbels in a difficult situation. On May 5 Goebbels wrote an article in the *Voelkischer Beobachter* under the heading "Quo Vadis Polonia?" in which he airs his annoyance with the Polish press. There among other things he says:

"It undoubtedly becomes more critical when on April 4 the *Express Poranny* writes that every Polish citizen should have as if it were in his heart a map of Poland, drawn as it should be drawn, if Poland is to have assured living conditions for a strong and permanent existence. . . . Here one sees a journalistic megalomania . . . from which one can

expect all kinds of things in the future!"

And Herr Goebbels continues:

"On April 30 the *Polska Zbrozhna* writes that admittedly only one graveyard of the old Slav kingdom remains today between the Oder and Elbe, but no one knows whether Providence has not decreed a national renaissance of this Germanized race."

In column after column Goebbels quotes the Polish press without really knowing how to oppose the "historic claims" of Poland. Thus he ends his article on the Polish question with the pitiful words:

"If on this occasion we are content to play a part of a mere recorder of a political situation, it is only in order not to complicate it still further. . . . The world looks to Warsaw and asks the anxious question: Quo Vadis Polonia?"

In his article of May 13 Goebbels in addition to the parts already quoted, commits several other tactical errors. True to his old method of providing surprises, Goebbels writes on May 13:

"We know that the press is not politics. . . . In the press one is accustomed to saying what diplomacy does not wish to say or, for the moment, cannot say."

For this reason the fascist gentlemen speak in their domestic policy of increased effort, readiness to pool and sacrifice for the *Volksgemeinschaft* (mutual welfare of the nation) because they "cannot say" to the German people: "train yourselves for war." In foreign policy they speak of "historic claims" and "historic rights" to foreign territory in order to put a flimsy mask over imperialistic expansion.

Yet the new method of "historic claims" has not brought the fascists the desired success, because, as Rosenberg expressed it, in the words of the *National Zeitung* of April 3: "a revaluation of German and European history" has not yet been brought about, and because the task of "rewriting world history . . . will require many, many decades." World history will be rewritten, but undoubtedly not in the way that the fascists expect. It will be written, not by the bloody hands of the executioners, but by the strong hands of the peoples, who in a historic struggle will oppose to the "historic claims" of the robbers their own claims to self-determination. Certainly the Polish people do not wish to conquer Prussia, but it was a correct thought to counter and prove absurd the exorbitant "historic claims" of German fascism by pointing to other "historic claims." With the same justification that the Germans claim Danzig, the English could claim back Hannover; the Swedes, Pomerania; the Poles, Prussia; and the French, half of Europe. There is no "historic claim" to conquest. There is, however, an elementary vital right for all nations to refuse to permit the fascist robbers to appropriate even a square inch of their land or once again to subjugate a town or country to their tyrannical regime.

Changes in Bourgeois Nationalism

FROM THE JACOBINS TO THE "MUNICHITES"

BY P. WIEDEN

ON THE one hand, the subjugation of the Austrians, the Czechs, the Slovaks, Albanians and Ethiopians—and finally also the Spaniards—by the fascist conquerors; and, on the other, the national war for liberation of the four hundred million people of China from the Japanese imperialists, and the national struggle for liberation of the various subjected peoples against fascist alien rule—all these facts call for the closest attention by the working class to the national question.

Memory of the French Revolution—which, one hundred and fifty years ago, swept away decaying feudalism and inaugurated a new era—is a further inducement to the working class to enter into the study of the stimulating problems relating to the national question. The German and Italian fascists have declared merciless war on the products and ideas of the French Revolution. The reactionary bourgeoisie in all countries—and not least in France—is continually prepared to consummate its betrayal of these products and ideas. The working class defends these products and ideas against the onward wave of fascist barbarism.

The French Revolution did not only inaugurate bourgeois-democratic liberties; as a process closely related to the first, it also brought the French nation to the forefront of the world's attention. Everywhere the nations were and are being formed in the process of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. The break-up of feudalism, the liberation of the serfs, the erasure of the narrow barriers of the estates of the realm and of the guilds, the confines of tolls and caste—all this resulted in a rallying together of the people into a nation.

The bourgeoisie—now become counter-revolutionary—endeavors by every possible method to obscure this *revolutionary historical origin of the nation.* The fascist ideologists try to convert the nation into a half animal and half mystical community of "blood and soil." They would like to hide from humanity the truth that nations arise and vanish according to historical processes; that they are not eternal, not something far above time and space but *represent stages in human development.*

It is necessary to answer this counter-revolutionary attempt to befog the issue by pointing to a whole series of historical facts. The national conception, the demand for the unification of the people into a nation, appeared everywhere in connection with the economic development of the bourgeoisie. The earlier in any particular country the bourgeoisie arose, the earlier it gained economic and political influence, the sooner did the conception of the nation arise, in the closest relationship to the struggle for democracy.

The economically progressive Italian city republics overthrew the feudal rulers as early as the middle of the fourteenth century. Simultaneously with the fall of the nobility and the rise of democratic tendencies within the narrow framework of the city republics, the de-

mand was expressed that this framework be burst asunder and Italy united nationally. This conception was most forcefully expressed by Cola di Rienzi, tribune of the Roman people, who called upon all the cities of Italy unitedly to throw off their yoke and to send representatives to a national parliament in Rome.

In medieval France it was the early developed urban bourgeoisie which demanded a united France and most vigorously supported the kings' measures of centralization. In medieval England, it was the alliance of the burghers with the smaller nobility from which, step by step, proceeded national unity, forcefully accelerated by the revolution of the Puritan commonality. In medieval Germany, the national idea arose in the period of flourishing merchant capital, of humanism and the Peasant War, to collapse wretchedly after the victory of the princes, and to rise again only in relation with the French Revolution.

It was in the struggle of the burghers and peasants against the nobility and the princes, in the process of the expansion of the merchant and money economy, in capitalism breaking through the too narrow husk of feudal society—in short, *in the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution—that the nation emerged and consummated its birth.*

Comrade Stalin has taught us how to distinguish the objective characteristics of the nation:

"A nation is a historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture."*

These objective characteristics find their subjective completion through national sentiment, national consciousness. *The people becomes a mass in the nation;* it experiences and senses itself to be a *mass unity.* In the history of the French Revolution, hundreds of convincing examples of this may be found—how peasants and townsmen, the artisans and intellectuals from various districts, who had been separated by feudal divisions, feudal privileges and feudal custom, by dialect and mode of life, united in a national mass and how they breathed in French national sentiment and national consciousness together with the breath of freedom. Out of this revolutionary mass experience arose the song and flag of unity, the *Marseillaise* and the Tricolor, arose the consciousness of being part of a great nation, arose revolutionary patriotism.

It is no accident that the consistent champions of the bourgeois-democratic revolution called themselves "patriots," that they were passionate and determined patriots. The peasant, who drove out the feudal lords and, for the first time, could call a piece of land his own in the full sense of the word; the burgher who saw the barriers fall which obstructed his economic and political ascent; the intellectual who stepped from the period of privilege into that of bourgeois-democracy—all of these had suddenly transformed France into their *fatherland,* into a fatherland whose defense they would no longer leave to mercenaries, but whose defense was taken over by a people which had become a nation.

The nation—this was the unity of the people against the feudal tyrants in France and Europe.

It is noticeable that in this young nation the demand immediately was heard to go yet a step further, not only to make a people into a nation, but to join all peoples in humanity. The conception *of the unity of the human race* breaks through all the first manifestations of the French Revolution, the conception of extending the revolutionary unity to all countries. It is a consciousness of a universal struggle, embracing all humanity, which was expressed in the proclamation of the Rights of Man, and which went its upward way to the German philosopher Fichte's declaration of the "equality of all that bears a human aspect," to Beethoven's stirring song of humanity:

* Joseph Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question,* p. 8. International Publishers, New York.

"Be embraced, millions, by the kiss of the whole world!" The people of the French Revolution broke through the narrow circle of feudalism, swept aside toll barriers, united separated districts, and brought together Béarnais and Bretons, Provencals and Lorrainers, into one united nation. Now, exalted with victory, they wished to sweep forward and realize the unity of the human race. Such is the tendency of young, revolutionary capitalism, which is reflected in these demands: the tendency towards the unification of the world through the production and exchange of goods, through technique, commerce and communications. In actual fact, the nation is but a stage in this development, but a stage over which they could not leap, and a stage whose duration is much greater than was expected by men in the early light of the young revolution.

The unification of a people into a nation, as opposed to feudal division, is as great a step forward as is capitalism, as opposed to production based upon serfdom; but neither capitalism nor the nation are the highest stages of production. In the dawn of capitalist society, liberty, equality and fraternity were *proclaimed* as eternal human rights—but only communism can *realize* these aspiration.

In the first glowing mass experience of national unity, all those who had hitherto been exploited and oppressed hoped that they would now belong to the nation as *free men and equals.* But soon they were convinced of the fact that, with the downfall of feudalism, the history of class struggles was not ended, that the class domination of the bourgeoisie was arising out of the victory of capitalism and the bourgeois-democratic revolution. The nation was divided into exploiters and exploited, into capitalists and proletarians, into oppressing class and oppressed classes. In the struggle against feudalism, the nation was a united front of the working people. After the victory over feudalism, however, the limited, the bourgeois, character of the revolution became obvious. In the place of the old class society, a new one arose, richer in productive forces, in creative possibilities, in the development of talents, but nevertheless a class society. The leading force, the backbone of the nation, was the bourgeoisie.

In vain did the most consistent Jacobins, in vain did Robespierre and Saint-Just, endeavor to go beyond the limits imposed by the productive relations, and to establish a society of free and equal men, based upon the petty bourgeoisie. The petty bourgeoisie was not, nor is it today, capable of taking a position at the head of society and establishing its own rule. Robespierre and Saint-Just had to fail; the bourgeoisie seized the power; capitalist class society succeeded feudal class society. The nation was ruled and directed by the bourgeoisie. Nationalism became a means of expression and a means of domination of the bourgeoisie.

Thus, right from the beginning, the quality of the nation was twofold. While arising out of the struggle of all working people against feudal tyranny, the nation became more and more the domain of the bourgeoisie, became more and more corrupted by the interests of the ruling class. The exploited worker, the needy toiler of all types, is also part of the nation. He shares the national mass experience in which are mingled so many memories of the struggle for freedom; in which the revolutionary origin—the united front of all toilers—from time to time becomes perceptible. He is instinctively prepared to defend the nation; foreign rule is even harder to endure than the rule of his own bourgeoisie; and whoever defends the nation against foreign aggressors is defending a scrap of freedom, be it ever so small and shadowy.

Finally, the bourgeoisie has always known how to disguise its aggressive wars as defensive wars, and to conjure up the memory of that revolutionary past when the mass nation *actually did* fight for its freedom, when the united front of all toilers *was an actual fact.*

On the other hand, the workers, in the course of their class struggle against the bourgeoisie, must realize that the ruling class continuously represents its

own egoistic class interests as "national interests"; that the ruling class holds down the proletariat in the name of the "national interests" and seeks to egg on the toilers of various countries one against the other; that it employs the pretext of "national interests" not only as a cloak for unsavory business deals but also as a poisonous weapon against the oppressed.

This knowledge must develop among class-conscious workers the deepest mistrust of national unity and of nationalism. The most advanced workers obtained ever increasing understanding of the sharp rejection of bourgeois nationalism by Marx, Engels and Lenin. In connection with the first imperialist world war, masses of the workers came to abominate bourgeois nationalism and its despicable product, social-patriotism. Many revolutionary workers identified the national idea with the reactionary chauvinism of the bourgeoisie, and to the social-patriotism of the Second International they opposed the complete negation of the nation. In this, however, they overlooked the fact that, although the nation is indeed ruled by the bourgeoisie, it is not identical with the bourgeoisie. The Communist International, in its manifesto on the occasion of the twenty-first anniversary of the great socialist revolution, characterized the nation as follows:

"The nation is not the gang of fascists, reactionary financiers and industrial magnates who rob and betray the people. The nation is the many millions of workers, peasants and working people generally—the people that is devoted to its country, cherishes its liberty and defends its independence."

In order to understand the transformation of national feeling and national consciousness from the revolutionary patriotism of the Jacobins to the counter-revolutionary chauvinism of the imperialist bourgeoisie and the treacherous capitulation of the "Munich" politicians, one must call to one's mind *the changes which have taken place in capitalism.* The relation of the bourgeoisie to the nation, the direction in which it has sought to canalize national feeling, all this has always depended upon the particular stage of development of capitalism at a given period.

When capitalism was developing within the narrow shell of feudalism, and more and more impetuously striving to break out into freedom, the bourgeoisie stood at the head of the national and revolutionary movement. The new productive forces within the old feudal order (the rise of manufacturing and of machine in production) constituted an increasingly acute contradiction to the feudal productive relations which were dependent upon serfdom. Productive forces are "the most mobile and revolutionary elements of production," as the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* says (page 121; English edition).

Driven forward by this mobile and revolutionary element, the bourgeoisie fought for the abolition of serfdom, for capitalism needed wage-workers who had the right to migrate; it fought against the limitations of the feudal order, for capitalism needed free competition; it fought for the elevation of the cultural level because:

"The new productive forces require that the workers in production shall be better educated and more intelligent than the downtrodden and ignorant serfs, that they be able to understand machinery and operate it properly."*

The liberty of movement of the workers, no longer tied to the soil; the breaking up of the medieval isolation of estates, guilds, provinces, and so on; and the infiltration of knowledge and education into the masses—all this formed the basis upon which the nation appeared. During its revolutionary phase, the bourgeoisie fights consciously for the nation; that is, for a social condition in which the inhabitants of a country are not separated the one from the other by unsurmountable barriers of birth, sta-

* *History of the C.P.S.U.(B.)*, p. 125, International Publishers, New York.

tion and descent, but in which they all feel themselves to be citizens, Frenchmen, British, Italians, or Germans. It is true, of course, that the exploited workers and other toilers were only admitted, through the bourgeois-democratic revolution, to formal citizenship; in actual fact the bourgeois-democratic state was only an instrument for their oppression. Naturally, they only became aware of this truth after the victory of the bourgeoisie, and in the course of a long and bitter class struggle.

The illiterate serf, for whom his feudal master was the first and final authority, could not feel himself to be a citizen of a state, a Frenchman or a German. He had first to break the bonds of serfdom in order to unite with all other citizens to constitute a nation.

The new productive forces, which brought capitalism into existence, also produced the nation. The bourgeoisie, the owner of the new means of production, won its social victory at the head of the nation. It established its class rule and destroyed the dream of the masses, that the nation was composed of beings free and equal.

The workers, who had helped to clear the way for capitalism, and who had shed their blood for the bourgeois-democratic revolution, felt in their bones the brutal class character of this new social condition. They had thought that the new fatherland belonged also to those who had built up the nation, and then were compelled to realize that capitalism did not concede the proletarian a fatherland. The nation had remained in debt to them for practically everything, and so they could look upon it only with more or less indifference.

There were other reasons, also, why the national zeal of the bourgeoisie cooled off in the period of victorious, still-ascending capitalism. The victorious ruling class began to extend beyond the nation. It saw the whole world open before it. From the international interrelationships of capital arose a new ideology. It believed *liberalism* to be an irrefutable gospel; it was optimistic and *cosmopolitan.* It looked upon nationalism as being exaggerated and left it to the petty bourgeoisie. And the petty bourgeoisie clad its aspirations in the garments of nationalism and thus carried on its hopeless struggle on two fronts: against the rising proletariat and against advancing finance capital.

With the transition of capitalism into the period of imperialism, the attitude of the bourgeoisie towards nationalism underwent yet another change. In the frenzied struggle for the division of the world, in the struggle for colonies and spheres of influence, the bourgeoisie had need of nationalism as a means of intoxicating the peoples. Capitalism had already passed its peak period; from a driving force, it had become an obstructive, reactionary force. As the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* states:

". . . by expanding production and concentrating millions of workers in huge mills and factories, capitalism lends the process of production a social character and thus undermines its own foundation, inasmuch as the social character of the process of production demands the social ownership of the means of production; yet the means of production remain private capitalist property, which is incompatible with the social character of the process of production. . . .

"This means that the capitalist relations of production have ceased to correspond to the state of productive forces of society and have come into irreconcilable contradiction with them."*

The bourgeoisie, become reactionary, adopted a thoroughly reactionary nationalism which rose to a frenzied *chauvinism.* This nationalism, kindled by the reactionary bourgeoisie in the period of declining capitalism, was used to set the peoples one against the other, and to mobilize broad masses of the people against the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat. While the bourgeois-democratic revolution had dreamed of world liberation, the bourgeoisie now advocated world domination. The subjuga-

* *Ibid.*, p. 126.

tion of foreign peoples, the confusion of the petty bourgeoisie, the poisoning of the working class, and the binding of the masses of the people to the war-chariot of imperialism—this now became the purpose of nationalism. From the revolutionary nationalism of Robespierre and Saint-Just, through the cosmopolitanism of Herder and Goethe, the path of the bourgeoisie led to the bloody morass of the most reactionary and contemptible betrayal of the people under the banner of "nationalism" and "patriotism." In the first imperialist world war, the criminal chauvinist "ideology" of decaying capitalism celebrated its triumph.

But the process of decay did not end there. The reactionary bourgeoisie has gone further. It lays the axe at the roots of all nations. It is preparing to destroy all the ideas and achievements of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, and with this the *foundation of all nations.* On the one side, we see *fascism* which not only drives foreign peoples into colonial slavery but also converts the members of its own people from *citizens* into *subjects* without rights.

On the other side, in the non-fascist countries, we see the open betrayal of the nation by the reactionary bourgeoisie. Hitler and Hacha, Mussolini and Bonnet, are but two sides of one and the same coin. In the fascist, as in the non-fascist, countries of the capitalist world, *the contradiction between the interests of the nation and the interests of the ruling circle of finance capital* is becoming ever wider and more glaring. The ruling circles of finance capital can see their sole hope for escape from the incessantly approaching historical reckoning only in the complete fettering and gagging of the masses of the people. The masses of the people are coming more and more to see, in the overthrow of the ruling circles of finance capital, the sole escape from a decline into barbarism, and from the threatening catastrophe of a new imperialist world war.

Not only the interests of the working class, but also those of the entire nation, in every capitalist country, demand with ever-growing urgency the overthrow of the small gang of capitalists whose domination not only battens down the productive forces and engenders one crisis after the other, not only drives larger and larger sections of the people into misery and despair, not only fosters a war of gigantic proportions, but also injures the national existence of the peoples.

The bourgeoisie—once nationalist-revolutionary, then cosmopolitan, then reactionary and chauvinistic—has now became the destroyer of nations, just as capitalism has changed from a constructive to a destructive force. The bourgeoisie, which once entered upon its domination at the head of, and with the help of, the nation, now trembles lest it lose its domination through a great national movement. It is not by chance that the German fascists are coming more and more to use such imperialist terms as "Reich," "greater German Reich," and so on, instead of the word "nation." Recently, they have even begun to argue against the use of the term "nation" and to qualify it as an "invention" of the French Revolution. The further their imperialist aggression proceeds, the more do they deliberately endeavor to extinguish the German nation and to breed "human material" which will be prepared to shed its blood for the "world empire" of German finance capital. It is the will of the fascist dictators that the Germans shall not feel themselves to be a nation but "followers of the Fuehrer." It is well known that the fascist bourgeoisie also fears that the tide of a genuinely national movement may sweep over it.

Confronted by this situation, the attitude of the working class towards the nation also undergoes a change. In the national liberation struggle against alien invaders the working class steps into the leadership of the nation. The masses of the people learn by experience that the working class is the most loyal and most consistent defender of national independence.

On the one side they see the national betrayal of the reactionary bourgeoisie and the vacillating spirit of the petty

bourgeoisie in decisive situations; on the other side they see the unbreakable steadfastness with which the Spanish, Chinese, Austrian and Czech peoples defend their cause against alien rule. And finally they also see that only in one country all nations are living and working fraternally side by side, developing their national culture in complete freedom, and manifesting in complete harmony their love for, and loyalty to, their common fatherland, *the Socialist Soviet Union.*

Only too often have the nationalistic loud-mouths in all countries proved themselves in critical periods to be capitulators and traitors. Franco, the Spanish "nationalist," has delivered up his country to the Germans and Italians and with their help has massacred the Spanish people. The "nationalist" bourgeoisie of France has been systematically enfeebling France and surrendering one position after the other to the deadly enemies of France. The "national" leaders of the Czech agrarians—who stigmatized as a "traitor" everyone who was in favor of a bi-lingual system—have delivered Czechoslovakia over to German fascism without a struggle. It has been, and is now, the workers who—rejecting all market-place barking of nationalism and opposing all chauvinism—have, in the hour of danger, marched ahead of the nation, steadily, and resolute in struggle.

We are no nationalists, and shall never be nationalists. We are internationalists. *For us, the nation is not the highest. For us the highest is socialism, communism. The nation is one stage towards humanity.* We neither will nor can overleap this stage. We shall defend it against all those who try to drive us back to a lower stage. At the Seventh Congress of the Communist International Comrade Dimitroff clearly expressed our attitude towards the nation when he said:

"We Communists are the *irreconcilable opponents, on principle,* of bourgeois nationalism of every variety. But we *are not supporters of national nihilism,* and should never act as such. The task of educating the workers and all toilers in the spirit of proletarian internationalism is one of the fundamental tasks of every Communist Party. But whoever thinks that this permits him, or even compels him, to sneer at all the national sentiments of the broad toiling masses is far from genuine Bolshevism, and has understood nothing of the teaching of Lenin and Stalin on the national question."*

At a lower stage of the productive forces, human beings gathered together in small groups in order to carry on the struggle against nature. At a higher stage occurred the coming together in city communities which often expanded into states; in this period the overwhelming majority of human beings were excluded from human society and condemned to bestial slavery. In the stage of capitalism, in the process of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, there took place the unification into the nation, into "stable communities of language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture." The nations outlast capitalism; further than that, they first experience their manifold harmonious development in socialism. But, at the same time, in socialism there also develops a community which transcends all national limitations, developing no longer as a dream and a demand, but as a joyful reality—*the unity of all those who bear human form.* Every citizen of the Soviet Union feels himself to be, above everything, a Soviet human being, a member of a great Soviet fatherland. For the Russian, the Ukrainian, the Georgian or the Uzbek, the socialist content is the essential, the decisive factor in the flowering of his national cultural. Step by step, national differences retreat behind that which unites them all, behind socialism which has freed man from the shackles of the

---

* Georgi Dimitroff, *Working Class Unity—Bulwark Against Fascism,* pp. 79-80, Workers Library Publishers, New York.

past, from condemnation and from national and social inferiority, and has formed him into a *personality*. In the pre-socialist world it was only a few, only the most outstanding human beings such as Shakespeare and Goethe, Leonardo da Vinci and Beethoven, Marx and Engels, who grew beyond all national limits and came to belong to all humanity. *In the socialist world, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands and millions grow beyond all national limits, to belong to all humanity.*

Upon the path out of the narrow confinement of the primitive forests towards the expanses of humanity, appeared the nations. We defend the nation—this mass of workers and peasants, artisans and intellectuals, who are bound together by territory and language, history and psychology—against all foreign rule. We fight for the self-determination of all nations, for their liberation from the clutches of decaying capitalism which obstructs their development, suppresses their creative powers and undermines their foundations. Through socialism we desire to realize and shall realize that of which the fighters for freedom dreamed when they aided the nation to be born: a society to which all its members belong with genuinely equal rights and genuinely equal opportunities for development.

The working class marches in the vanguard of the nation in order to realize socialism, and through socialism, humanity.

"We are well aware that our Soviet system has already created all the requisites for a further rapid rise in the material and cultural standard of the working people, for the creation of an abundance of goods and products, and for the satisfaction of the rapidly growing cultural demands of the working people. Everything now depends on the growing communist consciousness of the workers, peasants and intellectuals. It is on the success of communist education, in the broad meaning of the term—a communist education embracing the whole mass of the working people and the whole body of the Soviet intelligentsia—it is, above all, on our success in this sphere that the accomplishment of all our other tasks depends."—V. Molotov, *The Soviet Union in 1942: The Third Five-Year Plan*, p. 69.

The International Significance of the Anti-Fascist Struggle in Germany

BY W. ULBRICHT

IN BEHALF of the German bank and trust magnates, Hitler answered the peace proposal of Roosevelt by a Berlin-Rome military alliance as well as by the breaking of the Anglo-German naval agreement and the German-Polish treaty. The German fascist war party has thus expressed its will for an intensified imperialist aggression. The fascist powers themselves tore the mask off the anti-Comintern pact and expressed on paper their will for aggression against France and England.

Before the war of intervention in Spain and the annexation of Austria, German fascism prepared its war plans by means of trade agreements enforced upon the contracting parties by political pressure. Since last year, with the assistance of its reactionary friends abroad, it passed over to the military occupation of foreign countries. This change in the situation has been pointed out by Comrade Stalin in his report to the Eighteenth Party Congress of the C.P.S.U. (B.) as follows:

"It is not longer a question of competition in the markets, of a commercial war, of dumping. These methods of struggle have long been recognized as inadequate. It is now a question of a new redivision of the world, of the spheres of influence and colonies by military action." *

Hitler puts forward further territorial demands. General von Epp stressed these demands at the German colonial conference. It is symbolical that this conference should have been held in Vienna, the capital of the first state occupied by Hitler. In his opening speech the general said: "Home colonization which has been practiced for hundreds of years from and in the Eastern march and overseas colonization are not mutually exclusive—they supplement each other." Thus the German fascists not only consider Austria, which they term the "Eastern march," as a colonial territory, but they also declare that the colonization inside Europe does not exclude the conquest of colonial territories overseas. At the same time Vienna is to serve as a fulcrum for further "home colonization" in the Balkans.

The seizure of deposits in the German banks, savings banks, insurance companies and the confiscation of Jewish property in Germany is followed by the plunder of foreign countries. German fascism which protested demagogically against the Versailles tribute now itself not only imposes tribute upon the conquered peoples with the help of its bailiffs and black S.S. troops, but forbids the development of their industry, limits the importation of raw materials for articles of common use and even introduces a poll tax similar to the so-called Negro tax of the former German colonies. The standard of living of the people is being further lowered by the raising of prices and imposition of higher taxes. The old fascist industrial magnates and

* Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, p. 9.

the new Nazi millionaires of Berlin want the common people of European countries to toil for them. Workers from Vienna and Bratislava, from Prague and Reichenberg, are being sent to East Prussia and Western Germany for forced labor as were the inhabitants of Belgium in the World War.

German fascism does not seek undeveloped countries rich in raw material or with possibilities of profitable capital investment. Its aggression is directed rather against countries in which it can rob capital, where modern war industries exist and where there is a most highly developed agriculture.

Fascist propaganda in Germany fully explains in detail the basis for its plans of conquest. For instance, in the textbook for the training of the Hitler youth, French territories are openly demanded. This handbook is published by the publishing house of the N.S.D.A.P.—the property of Hitler. Alsace-Lorraine, parts of Northeast and Eastern France, as well as Holland, Belgium and Luxemburg, are called "lost German regions," and Lille and Verdun, German towns.

Fascist aggression was first of all directed against the smaller countries, now it impinges on the spheres of interest of the big powers of Western Europe in Europe and in the Mediterranean. It becomes increasingly clear that Hitler is directing his policy of conquest basically against France and England, against the countries whose reactionaries encouraged him to further aggression at Munich. The fascist occupation of Austria and Czechoslovakia, Hitler's aspirations to world domination and the further war preparations of the Axis powers, show that the salvation of peace demands the *overthrow of the fascist warmongers who rule.*

Many people in France and England who, before Munich, thought that the fascist conquest of Czechoslovakia was not their concern, are beginning to realize now that the fascist offensive is directed against their own country, their own democratic rights and even their very lives. German fascism, its allies and agents threaten the existence of the mass of the people and the rights of the people of other countries; everywhere they are the enemies of human civilization. *That is why the development of the struggle for freedom of the German people has become the central problem of the fight for peace and progress the world over.*

The touchstone of sincerity in the struggle for peace for all the workers' parties, trade unions and other working class associations, for all peasant and farmer unions, for all the progressive forces of the world, is support of the anti-fascist struggle in Germany.

Every true friend of peace and progress must have become convinced in the last few months that "even with the best will one cannot live in peace when the wicked neighbor will not allow it." In other words, the constant threat, the predatory war excursions against other people will only cease when the seat of the warmongers, the rule of Hitler fascism, is abolished.

In this fight against the enemy of mankind, the heroism of the fighters for freedom in Germany is closely linked up with every advancement in the common fight of all the peoples. When the Czechoslovakian people suppressed the Henlein putsch last September, the people's movement grew in strength in Germany. This initial resistance of the Czechoslovakian people fostered the will for resistance in the German people. Wide masses of the population saw the possibility of overthrowing the fascist regime by a united struggle of the common people in Germany with the progressive forces all over the world. The prospect of a victorious fight for freedom was looming nearer.

What tremendous significance it would have if organizations of different countries, linked in a united front—miners', metal workers' and transport workers' trade unions, as well as organizations of peasants, farmers and intellectuals—were to inform the German fighters for freedom about their own advances, problems and prospects of their struggle. On the other hand, joint action of workers against fascism and the common partici-

pation in the struggle of all the active anti-fascists in Berlin, Hamburg and the Ruhr would revitalize the struggle against fascism outside Germany.

The other peoples would see the true representatives of the German people, the friends of freedom and peace closing their ranks and consciously mobilizing the common people for the great fight for freedom against the fascist tyrants of Germany.

Such an approach to this problem immediately evokes the question: To what extent have the conditions developed for the fight of the German people for the liberation of Germany from the rule of the fascist warmongers? What is the effect of the fascist war policy on the German people itself, and how does the changed attitude of the common people manifest itself as compared, for instance, with 1936, when universal military service was first introduced?

At that time the people still believed that the issue was the national independence of Germany against the Treaty of Versailles. Hitler declared that the German people wanted to be masters only in their own home. Since then, the fascist war of intervention in Spain and the suppression of the national independence of Austria and Czechoslovakia have shown that German fascism wants to be master in other people's homes and is prepared to lead Germany into another war in the interests of German big capital.

When, in the summer and autumn of 1938 the masses of the people learned how Hitler was provoking war, the opposition manifested itself openly. "The will to force freedom of speech was widespread," writes a comrade. The majority of people declared themselves against the policy of conquest. In various factories courageous workers proclaimed solidarity with the Czechoslovakian people and organized sabotage of war production.

Hitler utilized the stress of the economic crisis to stimulate an appearance of prosperity by the so-called creation of employment in the war industries and road construction. However, it became apparent to the masses of the population that the fascist war economy led to the impoverishment of the people and entailed the worst form of forced labor and scarcity of raw materials and foodstuffs. The common people have also learned from experience that the conquest of foreign territories brings for them ever greater burdens and benefits only the big capitalists. The characterization of German economy as given by Comrade Stalin in his report to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.) was fully appreciated by the common people of Germany. Comrade Stalin said:

"It means giving industry a one-sided, war direction; developing to the utmost the production of goods necessary for war and not for consumption by the population; restricting to the utmost the production and, specially, the sale of articles of general consumption—and, consequently, reducing consumption by the population and confronting the country with an economic crisis." *

The squandering of the economic forces of the country for their policy of conquest by the most reactionary imperialist circles of German big capitalists who seized power in 1933, undermined the foundations of German economy. German fascism tries to overcome its difficulties by the enslavement of other people because the rotten capitalist system is incapable of solving the vital problems of the German people, because the conflict between its desire for profit and the vital interests of the toiling people becomes clear to an ever-increasing number of the population, in spite of all phrases about the community of the nation.

Those who hear the speeches about the alleged strength of German fascism and read the statistics of its military equipment should always ask themselves the question: *What do the people say?* There has arisen a deep opposition between the fascist rulers and the great masses of the people.

---

* *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

While previously discontent expressed itself mainly in grumbling at particular measures of the fascist authorities, opposition is now directed more and more against fundamental causes, against Goering's war economy and against the fascist regime. More and more the fascist war policy is being held responsible for all suffering and difficulties.

On the one hand fascism sharpened the terror, militarized its economy and introduced forced labor, converting Germany into a large prison, but on the other hand, the war economy and war policy evoked discontent among the masses of workers, peasants, middle-class, intelligentsia and even in bourgeois circles, awakening their will to resist.

Last autumn it became apparent how many were opposed to Hitler. An anti-fascist reports: "Last September the greater part of the people perceived how hollow was the regime. The common people said: Hitler's thousand years are coming to an end."

Although Hitler was delivered from this difficult situation by the reactionary forces of England and France, a deep mistrust still remains among the people.

German fascism intended to destroy Marxism. It has created, however, by it policy in the interests of the trusts, such a sharpening of class contradictions that opposition and resistance to the unbearable exploitation are increasing and the common people have become more ready to appreciate the Marxist understanding of the class struggle.

German fascism wanted to exterminate Bolshevism but it only succeeded in increasing the prestige of the socialist Soviet Union among the German people. Everything progressive and free is labeled by the fascists as Bolshevism, and all decent people are called Bolsheviks. This only creates a desire in many of them to become better acquainted with Bolshevism, in order to compare the barbaric conditions under the rule of the "National-Socialism" in Germany with victorious socialism in the land of the Soviet power.

When fascism started its war provocation, the democratic forces of the German people could see only one power which was consistently fighting for freedom, only one power which showed how to deal with fascist aggressors (the incident at Lake Khasan), only one power which helped the Spanish and Chinese people attacked by the fascist war bloc—the socialist Soviet Union. In the last few years the common people of Germany have learned from experience also that the Soviet Union is the decisive force in the fight against fascism.

The German workers who must toil under the whip of fascist trustified capital reflects on the reasons for his misery, and the peasant, whose economic position is ruined by the fascist rule of the big capitalists, is interested in the condition of the collective farmers in the Soviet Union. The fact that in fascist Germany the power of the banks, trusts and armament interests was strengthened, whereas in the Soviet Union all exploiting classes, and hence all warmongers, were destroyed, serves the common people as an object lesson of what revolution is and what is fascist counter-revolution. As a result there is an increasing sympathy to the Soviet Union and in many cases a desire to follow the example set by the Bolsheviks.

The most active revolutionary workers and other anti-fascists are today of the opinion that the time is ripe for the unity of all anti-fascists in order to *mobilize the people to save Germany from fascist barbarism.* These revolutionary forces in Germany maintain that mass discontent has reached such an extent that it is possible to carry out protest actions on a greater scale and bring together all the active forces in a struggle organized on a common basis.

Many anti-fascist workers who, under the difficult conditions of fascist terror, limited their activities for a long time to friendly relations with other anti-fascists, saw, last autumn, *new possibilities of action.* Generally, the growing opposition is expressed in the whispering propaganda against Hitler's war policy and in the passive resistance against speed up and the increase of the working

day. In the munitions factories of West, South and Central Germany, the fascist authorities issued a proclamation threatening heavy punishment to all who "do not carry out their work conscientiously, who refuse work or malevolently slow up production."

Many workers attempt to force an increase in their wages by giving notice or by slowing down production. In some of the pits of various coal basins, miners agreed to refuse Sunday work. This happened after an express declaration of the fascist leaders that Sunday work must be carried out in the interests of intensified rearmament. This shows that the protest was not made because of the bad working conditions but due to the growing understanding of the workers *that every increase in production helps the war policy of fascism*, and that low wages are due to the enormous squandering on armaments.

Inspired by such mass feelings, numerous workers protested at a meeting of the Labor Front in the *Rheinmetall* armament works by the following interruptions of the Nazi speaker: "We want a shorter working day." "We want more wages," and another shouted: "and more freedom." Suddenly above all the din a worker's voice was heard: *"Down with Hitler!"* These slogans, which have been constantly painted on walls and fences by Communists since 1933, have now become the slogans of the masses.

Not less heroic was the action of a worker in a department of a large armament factory in Wurttemburg last September, who spoke in favor of support for Czechoslovakia and ended up with the slogan: "Long live Czechoslovakia!" The worker was arrested but *his action awakened in the workers the will to resist and strengthen their internationalism.* His place will be filled by countless other anti-fascist fighters. The sacrifice of this heroic fighter will bear fruit in future mass actions of the workers, in the rise of a large movement for freedom of the German people, in the people's revolution. An eyewitness wrote about the feeling of the miners last April as follows: "If we only had an organization the whole of the Ruhr would have gone on strike." *What is lacking is a strong illegal party organization closely linked with the masses and unity of action of all anti-fascist workers.*

The Communists and anti-fascist forces were not sufficiently prepared for such sudden changes in the situation. Under fascism it is normal that mass discontent should grow underground, breaking through into an open opposition when there is a general sharpening of the situation. It depends on the Bolshevik steeling of the Communist Party and on the united front of Communist and Social-Democratic officials in the principal industrial regions, whether and to what extent the opposition masses will be led into action and, through this activity, larger anti-fascist organizations built.

This will determine the creation of a united front and a broad anti-fascist movement based on reliable supporters in factories and fascist mass organizations. The partial resistance offered in various factories and fortification plants in recent months shows that *actions took place in which a few heroic anti-fascists took the initiative, organized a general advance by the workers, and led the struggle themselves.*

The Communist Party of Germany considers as its main task in this situation to do everything within its power to bring about the unity of action of all the anti-fascist workers of Germany. The actions of the workers awaken and strengthen the will to resist among all the enemies of Hitler, above all, in the peasantry. Without an alliance between the working class and the peasantry, a people's revolution against the fascist regime is impossible.

In a leaflet distributed in the Rhineland on the significance of the anti-fascist struggle in Germany in connection with the international fight against fascism a group of Communist and Social-Democratic workers writes as follows:

"The greater part of the workers of our town and our region are true to the cause of the working class and to the cause of socialism. We do not stick our hands in our pockets, but, in spite of

terror and persecution we do everything to create difficulties for Hitler fascism in the political and economic field. *We know that we would not be worthy of the help of the working class of other countries, and especially of the peoples of the Soviet Union, if we did not do everything within our power to overthrow Hitler and to fight for a free democratic republic.*

"We know that this struggle can only be successful if the whole of the working class, Communists and Social-Democrats, in collaboration with Christian workers, go forward together, overcoming the old splits."

This declaration of anti-fascist workers who have joined in the united front is also an answer to those reactionaries outside Germany who insult the German people by identifying them with fascism. By spreading hatred against Germans and discrediting the German people by calling them fascists, they want, on the one hand, to divert the struggle of their own people against reaction, and, on the other hand, to hinder the solidarity of the anti-fascist forces of their own countries with the common people of Germany.

The fight for peace and against fascist aggression demands, however, the strengthening of the international solidarity of the working class and all progressive forces. *The fight of the German people against the rule of the fascist war party, the fight of the peoples against the fascist aggressors' war alliance, and the national revolutionary fight for freedom of the peoples oppressed by Hitler, are closely interrelated.* A successful fight for peace is impossible without an active support of the anti-fascist struggle in Germany and without a struggle for the liberation of the fighters for freedom and peace who are still in the hands of fascism—Ernst Thaelmann, Brandes, Rossaint, Niemoller and many other prisoners who are being tortured by fascism.

Some Social-Democrats and trade unionists in France and England believe that the German anti-fascists desire war. This is not true. The active anti-fascists in Germany are far more embittered by the encouragement given to Hitler's war provocations by the capitulationist policy of surrender of the reactionaries outside Germany, by the pacifist illusions in the ranks of the French Socialists and the British Labor Party, by the absence of international unity of action.

Who can think without disgust of the consequences of the Munich policy to Czechoslovakia and to the peace of Europe? The workers and all progressive people in Germany have repeated a thousand times with great bitterness that Hitler would have been forced to retreat had only international unity of the working class and a united front of all the people been achieved.

The immediate consequence of a united front of the peoples would have been an inner crisis of the fascist regime instead of a European war. Hitler was saved from that situation by the reactionary elements of the English and French bourgeoisie and by those reactionary Social-Democratic leaders who approved the Munich capitulationist policy.

The German anti-fascists are therefore of the opinion that the maintenance of peace depends first of all on the establishment of a united front of all the peoples against the fascist war bloc. By defending their own national independence and erecting a bloc of collective security against Hitler's war aggression, the peoples will not only fight for peace but also make it impossible for the fascist enemy of mankind, by successes in its foreign policy, to deceive the discontented German people and prevent it offering resistance. The German anti-fascists desire ardently *the strengthening of the English and French working class through unity* and that they wage a resolute struggle in their own country against the capitulators and fascist agents.

If the fascist war alliance is able to carry out its aggression without encountering a corresponding resistance of the masses of the people it is only because, as Comrade Dimitroff wrote on May 1:

". . . the working class of the capitalist countries have not succeeded in overcom-

ing the split in their ranks, in coming forward in a united front and in winning over their allies—the peasantry and the working people of the town." *

That holds good for the working class of Germany as well as the working class of England and France.

The most effective action for peace, and the most immediate assistance for the anti-fascist fight in Germany, would be the creation of international unity of action and the calling of an international workers' conference in which representatives of workers' organizations of all countries would come to an understanding about their common tasks in the fight against the fascist warmongers.

This proposition made by Comrade Dimitroff, the General Secretary of the Communist International, was welcomed by many workers' organizations. Some of the Social-Democratic leaders, although advocating the calling of a conference of governments, are stubbornly silent about the proposition of an international workers' conference. Would it not be the obvious thing for the representatives of all the workers' organizations to meet immediately in order to strengthen the anti-fascist forces of the people by their common action, thus increasing the pressure on their respective governments? Should not the working class itself, independent of government plans, put into practice a common anti-fascist policy?

What a great effect in promoting action would be created, for instance, by an appeal of an international workers' conference to the German working class and the German people! Would not a joint conference of workers' organizations serve as an example for the creation of unity of action in Germany and for the strengthening of resistance to fascism?

Hitler was able to achieve his temporary successes at home and abroad only because he was able to divide his enemies and isolate in advance the political forces and the countries against which he intended to deliver his blow. That is why any opposition to the creation of the united front of the workers and against the calling of an international workers' conference is a support for fascism.

What must be done is to forge a united front of the workers' parties and trade unions against the bloc of fascist aggressors in order to lay the foundation of a people's bloc against the fascist war aggressors.

* See *The Communist*, No. 6, p. 519.

The Flight From the Land in Hitler Germany

BY EDWIN HOERNLE

ON JUNE 6, an agricultural congress is taking place in Dresden, which delegates from various countries will attend. The German fascists have given main place on the agenda to the subject of the "flight from the land," which, in Hitler Germany, has assumed formidable proportions.

The fascist plunderers and destroyers of German agriculture are using this congress for the purpose of concealing from the suffering and bitterly resentful German peasantry the *special* causes of this flight from the land under the Hitler regime, and are endeavoring to explain it purely on grounds which exist in all countries.

Faced by the continual worsening of the conditions of the German peasantry, and the consequent bitterness aroused, the Nazi bureaucracy is endeavoring to represent cause as effect, and vice versa, in an effort to convince the peasants that the flight from the land is the sole reason for all their troubles.

Towards the end of 1938, the fascist central authorities found it necessary to provide a safety vent for the rising tide of the peasants' protest by means of a big campaign against the "migration" of agricultural laborers, by vague promises of larger subsidies, and—the most significant of all—by publicly addressing "demands," with apparent spontaneity, to the government. For instance, Chief Headquarters Staff Leader Reischle demanded the appropriation of surplus profits in industry, State Secretary Backe demanded the extension of the agricultural "marketing regulations" to industry; and Agricultural Minister Darré himself called for the large-scale provision of manufactured products to the peasantry at reduced prices.

The sixth "National Peasants' Congress," at Goslar, in November, 1938, was fully in the spirit of this new demagogy of the self-appointed "peasant leaders," whose increasing nervousness and partial confusion it reflected. This is the only possible explanation of the campaign—carred on since August, 1938, in the Nazi agricultural press and also in some leading urban newspapers and periodicals—against the "undervaluation of agriculture." Of course, the purpose of this campaign was purely to soothe and mislead, but it was a very risky thing to undertake. For obviously the mass of the peasantry, in their present situation, would take it seriously; and they have indeed done so. Now that the campaign has been summarily called off from above, the peasants are carrying it on from below.

The Reich Agricultural Department's bureaucracy now finds itself in a most difficult position. Both the Nazi party and the government are insisting upon an increase in agricultural production and deliveries at all costs, while the mass of the peasantry, on their side, are clamoring for the fulfilment of the "demands" enunciated at the "National Peasants' Congress."

DECREASE IN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

At Goslar, behind the official speeches, the "specter of decreasing production" was not the only one which appeared; there was also the specter of an agriculture that had been bled white, deprived of its most important working forces,

which caused the Nazi bosses great anxiety. One of the main maneuvers of the Reich Agricultural Department consisted in trying to prove that the first phenomenon arose because of the second, thus concealing the real facts: that both of them are the effects of one and the same main cause: the raping and compulsory regulation of agriculture by fascism.

The decrease in production of German agriculture may to some extent be verified by official statistics. For example, the review *Wirtschaft und Statistik (Economics and Statistics)*, records that the total milk production in Germany decreased by about 500,000,000 liters between 1937 and 1938. Also, as a result of the deterioration in the quality of the milk, the decrease in the production of dairy butter, in spite of an increase in the amount required for compulsory delivery, was so great that the appropriation of butter for children's rations had to be cut by 15 per cent.

In Germany's chief dairy-farming areas—Northern Hanover and Schleswig-Holstein—the 50 per cent decrease in milk deliveries in the autumn and winter of 1938-39 far exceeded the average seasonable decrease for all Germany.

Furthermore, the 10 per cent fall in hog raising, which first appeared in December, 1938, still continues. By March, 1939, in spite of urgent counter-measures by the government, which sees in the lack of fats one of the most sensitive spots in the agrarian side of its war preparations, this decrease had not been made up, nor, according to expert calculations, will it have been entirely restored even by next autumn.

According to the livestock census of December 3, 1938, the number of milch cows has also fallen by nearly 3 per cent, and the quantity of young cattle by over 8 per cent. According to reports in agricultural publications, the decrease in some farms of horned cattle amounts to as much as 30 per cent, and in some of them, even 50 per cent.

The satisfaction of the Nazi authorities, caused by the record grain harvest of 1938, as well as the good root crops and green fodder crops, did not endure for long. A substantial decrease threatens for the 1939 harvest. Not only on account of the extremely difficult winter that has been encountered—the autumn-sown barley and clover has been completely destroyed and part of the wheat —and not only because of the very cold and wet spring, but chiefly because of the great lack of care in plowing and sowing. The agricultural press is pessimistic. The winter sowing was far too late. There are far too many weeds in the grain fields. "Inadequate fertilizing is frequently apparent." At the time of the blackthorn blossoming, when customarily all the fields, even the summer sowing, should be freshly green, this year "large patches have not come up." In the beginning of May, a "considerable number of fields still awaited tilling." Furthermore, a scarcity of hay was announced in the early months of spring.

The government and the agricultural authorities attribute all of this exclusively to the "flight from the land." According to Darré there is a shortage of 900,000 workers—either agricultural laborers or peasants, one-fifth of the necessary labor power. Hence, they say, the decrease in milk deliveries as well as the deterioration in field work.

Now, what does this flight from the land, which is blamed for everything or nearly everything, really mean? First, we would draw attention to the deliberately obscure and changeable expressions of the fascist press, in this regard. First, it complains of the lack of workers, particularly milkers, teamsters, farm girls, and so on. Then, it turns to the "flight from the land" in general as the "most important problem," not only for agriculture but also for the whole food supply of the nation. Here, obviously, we encounter deliberate, demagogic confusion. It is true that there is a flight from the land such as has not been known in Germany for decades. We shall return to this subject later. But the "lack of labor" is a far wider conception, and we should try to discover whether, at the back of this, there is not a cause other than that of the "flight from the land" which the fascists so energetically push to the forefront.

For several reasons, we cannot expect statistical enlightenment in this matter. It cannot, however, be denied that a considerable section of the disastrously increased "lack of labor" in German agriculture is the objective, inevitable result of the fascist militarization of Germany. Let us take for instance the introduction of compulsory labor service, the universal compulsory military service in 1935, the doubling of the term of military service in 1936, the "large-scale maneuvers" which have been taking place with ever more frequency since 1937, the partial mobilizations, reserves' exercises, and marches into foreign territory.

Hundred of thousands of young rural workers and peasants have by this means been kept for months and even years away from their work; and under the conditions existing in the Hitler regime it is not to be wondered at that thousands of these militarized men never return to agriculture but look for quicker and easier advancement in the army, the "defense organizations," and in the party or state bureaucracy. Apart from this, there is the compulsory recruiting of the young country people in the Storm Troops and the Hitler Youth organization, which takes from them for non-productive purposes a good deal of their working time and, in spite of a lot of oral propaganda against it, really increases the flight from the land.

But this flight from the countryside is no simple "epidemic." The chief incentives are supplied by war economy and war policy. Chief among such incentives are the unpaid overtime, the vexations of a coercive economy, inadequate prices, rising taxes, and so on. These are the things which disgust the toiling people of the countryside with their occupation.

Let us cite here one example of unpaid overtime, as evidenced in the course of Hitler's famous "battle for production." The expansion of the cultivation or root crops, which since 1937 has been made compulsory by the Nazi authorities, at the expense of pasture land, fallow ground and grain cultivation, equals, according to the Nazis' own figures, an increase of 21,000,000 working days over 1935. But, for the peasant, the increased production achieved by this is in no way proportionate to the extra expenditure of toil and capital. Here we have genuine "diminishing returns." The peasants' lack of money and capital becomes greater.

It hardly needs mentioning that it is not only the peasants and their families who have to perform this extra labor without adequate reward, but also the farm laborers and peasants' household servants. The fall in cash wages since 1933, and the decrease in grain allowances since 1937, although insufficiently expressed in the official index figures, are eloquent enough.

That the lack of manpower, with peasants possessing land up to about thirty hectares, is much greater than among the big landowners, is confirmed by the state agricultural department. It is not only the result of the economic-geographical fact that in Germany the large peasant areas are considerably penetrated by industry and lie closest to the big industrial centers, from the point of view of transport, but also because of the fact—which the peasants themselves are continually reiterating—that they no longer possess the capital to hire labor.

Furthermore, the new law of inheritance has considerably encouraged the flight from the countryside, among those sons and daughters of peasants who are now excluded from participation in the inheritance and do not wish to be dependent upon their elder brothers. But the main reason for the flight is the realization of the complete lack of future prospects in an agriculture which has been warped by fascism, from which proceeds, in spite of all counter-propaganda, a growing sense of social inferiority connected with the practice of agricultural pursuits.

This, of course, is in vivid contrast to the alleged elevation of the peasants' social status by Hitler into a "new nobility of blood and soil," as well as the alleged improvement of the agricultural worker's position into that of a "learned profession" and "the peasant of the future"; but it does not agree with the actual facts of peasant life today under

Hitler. As, for instance, in a letter written by a minor agrarian official and peasant to his newspaper:

"The worst thing against which we local peasant leaders have to fight is the sense of inferiority which is becoming apparent here and there among peasants and farmers." (*NS-Landpost*, March 3, 1939.)

It is significant of the present situation in the German rural areas that words like these can be written by a minor state official and printed without comment in the central organ of the National Department of Agriculture, six years after the "salvation of the peasantry" by Hitler.

THE PRESENT SPIRIT OF THE PEASANTS

"Work Without Wages" was the demagogic title of one of the many articles written by National Department Leader Reischle (in the *NS-Landpost*, April 7, 1939) on the "Undervaluation of Agriculture."

How comes it that a highly-placed Nazi official, in the seventh year of Hitler's "glorious salvation of the peasants," should have to have recourse to such a devastating formula? Demagogic intentions are not sufficient to explain this wholly. The form of this demagogy has been impressed upon it by the pressure of masses of the peasantry. The peasant has wrung from Reischle this unwilling admission. It is the estimation which the peasant himself gives to his work.

The profound pessimism which nowadays fills the peasantry, with regard to their existence in the fascist "peasant empire," is well illustrated by a letter appearing in the *NS-Landpost* on March 10, 1939, and written by a Wurttemberg peasant owning a large farm, who also holds an agricultural diploma. He writes as follows:

"I myself shall not be able to avoid reducing my herd of breeding stock which it has taken me seventeen years to get together. Then my income will begin to fall, and there will also be a lack of the necessary dung for fertilization. . . . And already the income hardly suffices to cover all expenses."

With the mention of this letter we encounter a phenomenon which would appear to be at odds with the fascist principle of the totalitarian state and "planned economy," namely, the apparent possibility of open criticism which, all of a sudden—from last January until March—was granted to the peasants, not only in the agricultural press but in the leading daily newspapers as well, including the *Voelkischer Beobachter*. This procedure is very unusual in a country which otherwise is ruled by such ruthless terrorism; and, when contrasted with the simultaneous intensification of repressive measures against the peasants who fail in their deliveries or who neglect "regulated farming," must have profound and exceptional reasons for its appearance.

It is not hard to discover these exceptional reasons. Who are the writers of these letters? They are mostly large farmers, old members of the Nazi party, hitherto faithful supporters of Hitler and his policy. Among them are many lower party and government officials who until now have trustingly and obediently fulfilled their tasks, but who are now beginning to sense the resistance and protest of the masses of the peasantry, and to pass this pressure on to higher places. These letter-writers are full of concern and disquiet, not only for their own large-scale farming or small capitalist existence, but also for the existence of thousands of their fellows in the rural areas. This is particularly drastically expressed in a letter to the *NS-Landpost* (March 1, 1939), from a peasant Nazi functionary who states that he has noticed a "certain dull hopelessness" among the peasantry, and who asks: "How—oh how?—can we help the peasants?"

Here is but little left of that "blind faith in the Fuehrer" for which Goebbels asked in the Sudetenland, after that country's "return home to the Reich." On the contrary! Here, in clearest tones, we hear the lack of faith, the hopelessness, the weariness of the minor fascist

functionaries who can see no way out and are beginning to despair of their own party. This petty fascist official ascribed "dull hopelessness" to the peasants, even if he—or was it the editor? —attempts to modify it by adding "in some places."

Yes, indeed. The German peasant has become "hopeless" with regard to Hitler's promises, with regard to the possibility, under the Nazi regime, of ever again being able to lead an endurable existence. But this "hopelessness" is very dangerous to fascism. Not only because of the "specter of falling production," which weighs upon the minds of the Nazi high rulers like a nightmare, not only because of the disillusionment of masses of the peasantry, but also because this "hopelessness" is penetrating the fascist apparatus of domination, by a thousand and one channels.

It comes in through the Local Peasant Leaders, the Local Farm Advisers, the Local Departmental Managers, the Storm Troop Leaders, the Hitler Youth Leaders, the Local Peasant Women Leaders, and so on. With more or less rapidity they become infected; the infection rises higher until it begins to affect the highest places in the party and government machines. This explains the bitter accusation of "painting things black" which the *Deutsche Volkswirtschaft (German Agriculture)* in No. 11, 1939, hurled against the National Agriculture Department, which was said to have gone far beyond its aim with its inopportune discussions.

The letters and reports published in the fascist press—however carefully selected and pruned—very plainly reveal that nowadays not only the peasant but also the minor fascist functionary speaks a very different language from that used by the rulers. This applies with particular point to the letter, printed in the course of a long discussion in the *Voelkischer Beobachter* of January 8, 1939, of a peasant of Upper Bavaria, which was sent in by the local official of a rural labor exchange, and which the peasant himself described as a "letter of desperation."

This also applies to most of the "reports from the front" which the *NS-Landpost* published between January and March of this year, and in which, also, both peasants and minor fascist government officials expressed their opinions and feelings. This is worthy of our attention! "Reports from the front," they were called. Within the fascist "community of the people," then, there has arisen suddenly a "front," and this "front" hurls forceful charges, already partly inspired by hatred, against the existing circumstances—while, without exception, the letter-writers themselves have hitherto been among the most faithful supporters of the Nazi system.

These peasants, and these officials who are in close touch with the peasants, took the Nazi demagogy seriously. Without deliberate intent, their "reports from the front" are converted obectively into devastating accusations against the regime which they themselves serve. For example, a large farmer, with highly rationalized methods, writes, in a letter to the *Dresdener Nachrichten* that, in spite of a serious lack of man-power, his application to the Labor Service for the granting to him of five workers to assist in the harvest was denied, on the grounds that Labor Service men were only sent out to work "in whole troops"—in other words, on the estates of the big landowners. So the harvests of the peasants, even peasants with somewhat larger farms, can rot on the fields. And is it not a deadly contradiction to those fascist phrases regarding a great "upward swing" of agriculture in Hitler's "peasant empire" when a Wurttemberg Local Peasant Leader writes as follows to the *NS-Landpost*:

"I know many peasants and agricultural workers who, for the last ten years, have not been able to buy themselves a Sunday suit. Sometimes the newest suits date from the inflation period."

The inflation period, it will be remembered, was in 1922 and 1923! Or take even the ten years of which he writes. Ten years means four years of the worst world economic crisis, plus six years of

Hitler's rule. The fascist "salvation of the peasant" has not permitted the peasant to replace his "inflation suit."

Still more striking is the plaint of a peasant woman on a large farm in East Prussia. After reporting that one of her young servants, the daughter of a poor peasant, had stated, in reply to a question as to whom she would marry, "Marry a peasant? Never!" the writer continues, speaking now of herself:

"Do you believe the body can long endure it, working from fourteen to sixteen hours, like a beast of burden?"

Take again a peasant's letter appearing in the *Voelkischer Beobachter* on January 8, 1939, which constitutes a serious indictment of the Nazi system. This peasant writes as follows:

"If no relief comes for us peasants and peasants' wives, if the gentry of the towns get their servants and the peasants' wives get none, there soon won't be any peasants' wives nor any peasants."

Who are then these "gentry of the towns" who get servants while the peasants can obtain no help on their farms? They are the "gentry" who rule in Germany today. The question just now is not as to whether the writer of this letter realized the anti-fascist tendency of his words; it is the importance of these letters as original documents illustrating a changing mood in the masses.

These peasants' letters and "reports from the front" also throw a revealing light upon the flight from the land. It is alleged that the results of the investigation of the Department of Agriculture—consisting of taking examples at random!—were that 18 per cent of the agricultural wage workers, but only 3 per cent of members of peasants' families who are continually engaged in farm work, were abandoning agricultural work.

This alleged loyalty to the soil of members of peasant families is given the lie by peasants themselves and local officials. According to a special investigation carried out in Wurttemberg, it was found that there, out of a total of 515,000 persons working in agriculture, 90,000 have been lost since 1933. But this 90,000 is made up of 56,000 members of peasants' families, and only 32,000 agricultural workers. It is true that, taking the percentage of the total of each category, a greater proportion of agricultural workers have quit the land than of peasants, but it must be remembered that Wurttemberg is a country of small and medium peasants. Nevertheless, these figures completely destroy the fable that the migration from the countryside is practically confined to agricultural wage earners.

There are plenty of letters and reports from the rural areas which, with pointed examples, show that it is not only the village poor who take part in the flight from the land but also the young peasants. For instance, on March 31, 1939, the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* published a report in which their informant writes from Schleswig-Holstein that the flight from the land in that part of the country is a veritable epidemic. He writes:

"It is not only workmen who leave; but officials, peasants and their children choose other occupations, and even among the large landlords the attention is directed away from agriculture. . . . The daughters will marry anybody but a peasant, and the children refuse to carry on with work on the farm, which is without prospects."

"Without prospects"—this is the chief clue. Here is the true source of the "flight from the land." In six years, Hitler has deprived German agricultural life of all prospects for the future.

And it is this reason which keeps on recurring in the peasants' letters.

Nothing could be a more typical fascist distortion, however, than to put the cart before the horse and claim that it is the flight from the land which is responsible for the lack of future prospects in agricultural life. Here is what a peasant writes from Silesia to the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung:*

"Not only does the peasant receive

only the smallest return on his farm investment, but his labor is paid at a rate which is only about 60 per cent of that of an unskilled industrial worker."

This is the result of the fascist "just price" system and not of the flight from the land.

Let us now read what a peasant woman in Pomerania had to say to the *NS-Landpost* on February 3, 1939, with regard to the situation:

"Here we are almost in despair about the lack of labor and money, for, in spite of the utmost diligence and economy and the most intensive cultivation, the money flies away so quickly that there is hardly opportunity to see it. And with all this we are supposed to like life on the land? And plant this liking in the hearts of our children?"

The flight from the countryside—which the Nazis call the main danger—is referred to here only in passing as "lack of labor" while the lack of money gets far more attention.

In similar terms is a letter from a young peasant in the Upper Palatinate to the *NS-Landpost* on February, 3, 1939:

"In 1937 I received my efficiency diploma, but where is the return on my capital? The industrious peasant can only comply with his obligations, at least in part, by denying himself and his family and eating potato soup three hundred evenings in the year."

Later in his letter, this same peasant states that his seventy-year old father has had to replace their hired hand.

But enough of these examples. It is obvious that the ears of the fascist editors and big party bosses must soon have started to tingle. For they did not wish to hear this kind of things. They desired to inculcate a mood of endurance. They wanted to prepare the ground for new coercive laws for the rural proletariat, and to make certain small concessions to the peasants who employ wage-labor at the expense of the real wages of the workers. The people of the towns must eventually take notice of how things are going with the peasant, wrote the *NS-Landpost*, and then came the examples we have just cited of "painting things black"!

The German peasants have been taking advantage of the chinks in the muzzle which the Nazis, for demagogic purposes, and under their pressure, had to loosen slightly. When the heart is full, the tongue speaks, and their hearts were full of anger, disappointment, bitterness —not because of the "flight" of the land workers, not because of the allegedly high wages they could not afford, not because of the allegedly comfortable life of the industrial worker and his wife; but because of the "gentry of the towns," the lack of money and capital, the unendurable overwork to which they are condemned.

We do not know what the peasants also wrote about taxes, debts, interest, leases, compulsory labor, military service and the danger of war. Probably the fascist editors had neither the desire nor the permission to publish such letters. But even so, these "front reports" and peasants' letters form a most important contemporary documentation, a measuring-stick for the internal weakness in the rural areas of the Hitler regime.

A NEW RELATION TO THE WORKER

One thing, above all, is characteristic of these letters: the new attitude of the peasants towards the workers, the spontaneously expressed growing common opposition of small farmer and agricultural worker. Here is a letter from a fascist functionary and small farmer to the *Deutsche Landwirtschaftliche Presse* of January 21, 1939. He is an active collector for the "Winter Aid," and writes as follows:

"I have been shocked at the wideness of this difference [between the standards of living of the small peasants and the industrial workers] which still exists today. During recent years, since the overcoming of unemployment, it has become even greater. Now the independence of the occupation is no longer a substitute for social standing, and it is no wonder that the sons and daughters

of our peasants draw the obvious conclusions."

Not a word here against the higher standard of living of the urban workers. On the contrary, the transition from poverty-stricken peasants to proletarian appears to be natural. It is "no wonder" that the "conclusions are drawn."

In definitely industrial areas such as the Saar, this phenomenon is naturally even more evident. In the *NS-Landpost* of February 3, 1939, a peasant of the Saar writes:

"In my village, out of twenty-six young peasants of twenty-six and twenty-seven years of age, sixteen have quit farming, and the others would have also gone away were they not being held here by every possible means."

These young peasants do not always have to become urban workers because of material reasons. Their argument frequently is: "We won't remain peasants because if we do we shall not get wives." The same letter-writer provides proof of this when he writes:

"You can go through ten villages around here, looking for a girl who is willing to marry a peasant. You will hardly find one."

We have described the reasons for this already. So much have the social and ideological barriers between peasant and worker been effaced.

Even among the more well-to-do peasants we find suprising understanding of the demands of the rural proletariat. The writer of a letter—already mentioned here—to the *Dresdener Nachrichten* (mentioned in the *NS-Landpost* of January 6, 1939) says:

"The whole question of lack of manpower is one of wages and advantageous traveling facilities to the town for our workers."

For, adds this letter-writer, the worker "also wants—if only once a week—to visit the cinema and so on."

This is simply stated but quite justly observed. Low wages and the emptiness of country life are the strongest motives at the back of the mass flight of the rural proletariat from the villages. Against this, no "hired man's farms" or "landworkers' model farms," as suggested by the fascist press, will avail, nor the conception of each laborer being able to use a cow or "owning" his own cow. A certified agriculturist of Silesia writes quite candidly on this question in the *Deutsche Landwirtschaftliche Presse*, on April 24, 1939, as follows:

"I do not wish to open the whole question of carters. It should by this time no longer be a secret that the question of wages and living in comparison with the urban worker is a genuine one. No one will be satisfied with merely an inner attitude towards this matter, and it alone makes our position precarious."

It was not long ago that the Nazis were proclaiming that the question of agricultural labor was not one of wages but one of an "inner attitude," and it is upon this basis that the Hitler Youth is even now carrying on its campaign of "Back to the Land." But those who have to live and work on the land know better. They speak with scorn of Darre's patent solution, the so-called "hired man's farms" or farm acquired through labor.

It is stated quite sarcastically in a letter from Silesia to the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* of March 31, 1939, that "the hired man's farm scheme is not suited to stop the migration from the land." They are rejecting the fascist solution and demanding new and effective solutions. In opposition to Hitler, the peasants and the agricultural laborers are in the one front, together with all those who come between.

Let us close the series of these examples with the report of an official of a rural labor exchange in east Germany, together with the comment of the fascist newspaper which printed it, the *NS-Landpost* of February 10, 1939. What does this minor official say—whose particular function is the placing of applicants in various callings in this small county town? He quotes the application of an agricultural laborer who wants to change his trade. The worker

wrote to him as follows: ". . . and therefore I request you at last to free me from agriculture."

The official goes on to state that a "whole pile" of similar letters is lying on his desk. He then goes on to say:

"Here the farm workers withdraw from agricultural work with an almost hostile gesture. Here they curse their calling, which for many years they have so faithfully followed."

But what does the Nazi editor say to all this? He merely cries peevishly: "Let's have an end to all complexes!"

We have not specially picked our examples of this correspondence to the papers. Practically all the letters, which give the impression of being genuine, speak in the same terms. Even in the Nazi machine itself, a profound contradiction is appearing between the lower and higher strata. The high officials say: "The flight from the land is desertion of the flag." But the lower ones say: "The flight from the land is nowadays natural." Above, they say: "Prison and concentration camps for those who leave their place of work without permission." But below: "No one can be satisfied with an 'inner attitude.'" Above, they say: "Life on the land has a great ideal value! Therefore, back to the land!" But below, it is said: "Old land workers curse their calling which for many years they have so faithfully followed." Up above, they are saying: "The peasant woman is the mother of the nation!" But the peasant woman herself writes: "Do you believe the body can long endure it, working like a beast of burden?" The people above level the charge of "deteriorating peasant convictions." But below they cry: "How, oh, how can we get help?"

The entire German anti-fascist opposition must render thanks to the German peasants who, because of their pressure, have driven a breach in the wall of silence which has hitherto concealed the true conditions of the German countryside from the world. Through their spontaneous initiative, one of the weakest spots in Hitler's war preparations has been revealed.

"Millions of people in our country are burning with eagerness to go forward, to accelerate the solution of the fundamental economic task of the U.S.S.R.—in the shortest possible time to overtake and outstrip the most highly developed capitalist countries economically. The Third Five-Year Plan assigns the immediate tasks directed toward the prompt attainment of this goal. The more conscientiously we all discharge our duties, the more exacting toward themselves our organizers, our leaders, are, the greater will be our success."—V. Molotov, *The Soviet Union in 1942: The Third Five-Year Plan*, p. 57.

The Parliamentary Election in Finland

BY O. KUUSINEN

IN THE forthcoming Finnish general election, three political camps, so to speak, confront one another. They are as follows: (1) the fascist reactionaries; (2) the government bloc; and (3) the anti-fascist camp.

The camp of fascist reaction consists of the fascist party, the I.K.L., and the pro-fascist Coalition Party, the most important party of the Finnish reactionary large-scale capitalists and big landowners. In this camp may also be counted certain reactionary big bourgeois elements in the Swedish Party and also some groups and agents of the Coalition Party within the government parties.

Officially, the government bloc consists of the Peasants' League, the Progressive Party and the Social-Democratic Party, but its policy is decided by the Right and Centrist elements of the Peasants' League and the Progressive Party and the Right Social-Democrats.

The anti-fascist camp consists of forces which are partly within and partly outside the government parties. Among these the following may be counted: The Left and Center of the Social-Democratic Party and the trade union movement, a number of elements of the Left wing of the Peasants' League and the Progressive Party, and two small peasant parties. Most of these anti-fascists do not differentiate themselves from the government bloc. The Communist Party of Finland also naturally belongs to the anti-fascist camp, although this Party has been robbed of its legal rights and cannot therefore put up its own candidates in the election. Nevertheless, it is taking part in the election.

The last parliamentary elections in Finland, in 1936, resulted in a defeat for the fascist reaction. The opponents of the Kiwimaki pro-fascist government obtained a majority. The Social-Democratic Party gained 40,000 new votes and five more seats. This also signified a success for the united front movement among the working class, for part of the elected representatives of the Social-Democratic Party consisted of elements which supported the united anti-fascist front. The Communist Party had appealed to the workers to support such candidates.

At the presidential election at the end of 1936 and beginning of 1937, the fascist reactionaries suffered yet another defeat. It had become possible, during this election, to unite the broadest sections of the people in order to prevent the re-election of the arch-reactionary, President Svinhufvud, who, during his presidency, had proved to be a stubborn supporter of the government's pro-fascist domestic policy, its orientation towards Hitler Germany in foreign policy and its anti-Soviet war policy. The Svinhufvud electoral bloc secured only one-third of the total votes cast. Of decisive importance was the fact that the Social-Democratic electoral delegates [the people elect the delegates who, in their turn, elect the president.—*Trans.*], for whom the Communists also voted, received 90,000 more votes than at the preceding presidential election. The candidate of the Peasants' League, Kallio, was elected

as president, with the support of the Social-Democratic delegates.

The direct result of this presidential election was the formation of the present government bloc. This consists of three parties which, at elections, are supported chiefly by the working class (the Social-Democratic Party), the peasantry (the Peasants' League), and the urban petty bourgeoisie (the Progressive Party), and which therefore—at least during elections—feel themselves to be to a certain extent dependent upon these toiling, democratic sections of the population. If we bear in mind the fact that the representatives of the Peasants' League and of the Progressive Party, as late as in 1935 and 1936, formed part of the Kiwimaki government together with the Coalition Party, we must realize that the recent new grouping represents a relatively important political differentiation among the bourgeois parties of Finland. A weakening and a certain isolation of the fascist reactionary camp became evident.

But this did *not* mean that the new government would carry out a genuinely democratic, anti-fascist policy, that the political and economic interests of the toiling sections of the population would be effectively represented. Right from the beginning we Communists warned the workers of Finland against harboring any such illusion, while, at the same time, appealing to them to fight for their own interests and through their mass struggle to maintain continual pressure upon the government; for it had become obvious that only by means of such pressure would the government be compelled to take any steps whatever towards the fulfilment of its democratic promises.

During the two years that have passed, such pressure by the toiling masses and their organizations has, to some extent, been exercized. Generally speaking, however, this pressure was much too weak and inadequate. The pressure upon the government by the pro-fascist reactionary camp, on the other hand, was much more effective, and it is to this pressure that the government has yielded. In almost all questions, the government took care to act in such manner as to provide the Coalition Party with no occasion for criticism. This has throughout been the clue to the actions of the government. Both in the foreign, as in the home, field, its policy has been one of *capitulation* to fascist reaction.

In foreign affairs, it has adopted the policy of more and more extensive capitulation to the dangerous efforts of the Hitler government at establishing domination over the country. On the demand of German fascism, it withdrew from the sanctions obligations of the League of Nations. On the demand of German fascism, it agreed with the plan for the fortification of the Aaland Islands, which Hitler Germany hopes to get in its hands. It has done nothing to terminate or even reduce the secret "strategical cooperation" between the Finnish and German general staffs, although this "cooperation" threatens to transform Finland directly into an exercise ground of the German army, and although it also means, as the progressive newspaper, the *Häme*, wrote about a year ago, that:

". . . we have hardly any military secrets of any importance which are not known just as well to Germany as to ourselves."

The latest genuflexion to Hitler by the Finnish government was its reply to the question asked by Germany—on the occasion of President Roosevelt's open letter—as to whether Finland felt herself to be threatened by Germany. Everybody in Finland must clearly recognize that Roosevelt was perfectly right in thinking that Finland is menaced by fascist Germany. Yet, in its reply, the Finnish government merely provided proof that it belongs to those governments of which men say that they "do not ever dare to be afraid."

All these facts show that the present government of Finland has not even made the effort to liberate the country's foreign policy from tutelage to Hitler Germany; despite the fact that this tutelage, from year to year and week to week, obviously constitutes an ever-

growing danger to the freedom and independence of Finland.

This foreign policy of the government corresponds most immediately to the standpoint of the Coalition Party. In this party, the decisive elements are former "Suometarians" who, during the Russan imperial domination of Finland, toadied to the myrmidons of the tsars, and then in 1938 were prepared to submit the country to the yoke of German imperialism. Hence, they are by tradition traitors to the country and it is nothing remarkable that they should now also impress their policy of surrender upon the present government. What is, however, remarkable, is that the parties which constitute the present government should have fallen into the path of this "Suometarian" policy, the perils and ruinousness of which can be seen from the most recent example, namely, that of the Czech lands under Hacha. One can safely assert that, unless the Finnish government does not promptly alter its policy, it will come under such drastic pressure by German fascism that it will later be unable to free itself from its grasp, even if it desire to do so.

Naturally, the Finnish government cloaks its policy of capitulation with the slogan of "neutrality." Those who clamor most loudly after "absolute neutrality" are the direct tools of German fascism, the Finnish fascists and Suometarians, who are perfectly aware what kind of "neutrality" Hitler requires of Finnish foreign policy—exactly the same as he demanded first of Austria, then of Czechoslovakia, and now of Poland, Rumania, Belgium, Denmark and other states. This is exactly the type of "benevolent neutrality" that a wolf might ask of a sheep. Its starting point and basic conditions are: You shall not have recourse to the aid of others; you shall not look anywhere for protection; you must remain isolated from everyone who might afford you protection when your turn comes, when your existence is at stake.

It is quite obvious that Finland needs international guarantees for her independence and that she needs international protection from Hitler Germany. The interests of our people demand that the entire foreign policy of Finland be directed towards the securing of such guarantees and protection. It is necessary to free Finnish foreign policy from all tutelage to Hitler Germany. In the place of the present policy of capitulation, a policy is urgently needed of resistance to the demands of German fascism, and instead of self-isolation, a policy of international cooperation with those states which are opposing the plans of conquest of the fascist aggressors. Above all, Finland must convert her relations to the great socialist country of the Soviet Union into relations of sincerity, friendship and good neighborliness.

Only a foreign policy which is framed in accordance with these principles would be in harmony with the vital interests of our people and the security and independence of our country.

At the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade Stalin, in the name of the Soviet people, stated:

"We stand for peaceful, close and friendly relations with all the neighboring countries which have common frontiers with the U.S.S.R. That is our position; and we shall adhere to this position so long as these countries maintain like relations with the Soviet Union, and as long as they make no attempt to trespass, directly or indirectly, on the integrity and inviolability of the frontiers of the Soviet state."*

If this were taken into account, in Finnish foreign policy, the interests of the Finnish people would be best served. From the standpoint of peaceful, close and friendly relations, however, it is important to terminate the campaign of calumny against the Soviet Union which is being systematically carried on by several Finnish newspapers. Hitler Germany is the real enemy of the country;

---

* Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, p. 17. International Publishers, New York.

but it is not permitted in Finland to show that it is so. Hitler's dangerous plans of conquest are not allowed to be publicly exposed; on the other hand, the libelers of the Soviet Union are given every liberty for their campaign of hatred. Is this, by any chance, part and parcel of the notorious "policy of neutrality" of the Finnish government?

The present government has likewise taken the path of capitulation to the pressure of the Coalition Party in matters of domestic policy.

The government promised to take in hand the democratization of the army. It has, however, completely failed to carry out this pledge. Among the officers of the army and of the gendarmerie, as also among the government officials, is a large number of fascists who are preparing to strike against the still existing remnants of the parliamentary system. Yet the government has done absolutely nothing to bring about a cleansing of the army, gendarmerie and civil service.

The government pledged itself to liquidate the fascist party, the I.K.L. and its press. It at last started to put this promise into operation. But when the newspapers of the Coalition Party began to raise a clamor, and a couple of members of the Helsingfors lowest court decided in favor of the legality of the fascist party, the government rapidly retreated, as though terrified by its own daring.

Thus, the fascists are permitted in all tranquility to go on preparing their treacherous blows against the state and the country, but Communists, who defend democracy and the country's independence against fascism, are flung into prison. Even heroes who have returned from Spain, of whose fight in the ranks of the Spanish Republican Army the Finnish people should well be proud, are brought before the courts and sentenced.

The present government is sometimes termed a "workers' and peasants' government." But the government scarcely knows itself what it has done for the benefit of the working class and the peasantry. It is this which one must ask the government parties before the election. Undoubtedly, they will try to put off the toiling sections of the population with fine promises; but it is precisely for this reason that the electors in the forthcoming election must pay good heed that not those candidates be elected who promise everything, but those who *keep their word.*

The class-conscious workers therefore should support the following minimum demands, with regard to home policy:

1. Dissolution of the fascist party;
2. Purging of the army, gendarmerie and civil service of fascists;
3. Guarantees of democratic liberties for the workers and the anti-fascist movement;
4. Concrete measures for the improvement of the economic position of the working class, the poor peasants, the artisans and the brain-workers.

Candidates who do not support these minimum demands, nor declare themselves to be in favor of an anti-fascist foreign policy, have no right to ask for the votes of class-conscious workers.

The anti-fascist camp in Finland has not yet become united, nor has it yet overcome its own timidity. So far, it has not fought strongly enough. It has gone too far in its support of the policy of the present government. However, it is on the right path. It is to be hoped that the brilliant example of the recently deceased Professor Lassila will encourage all true anti-fascists in Finland to a stronger fight, both in the election as well as subsequently.

If the fascists (the I.K.L. party) and the pro-fascists (the Coalition Party) suffer defeat in the forthcoming election, and if the forces of the anti-fascist camp are strengthened, the results of the election can influence the government's policy to a definite degree. In such case—and only in such case—will the Finnish people derive direct benefit from the forthcoming election.

Political Mass Work and the Mass Organizations in North China

BY PEN DEH-HWAI

IN CHINA, in the fires of a war for liberation, a world historical event is being brought to fulfilment; *four hundred million people are coming together as a nation.* The masses have awakened from their thousand-year sleep. The peasants, who were accustomed to suffer blows and abusive treatment with indifference, and who were not even concerned about who were their oppressors, have now risen to self-consciousness and national consciousness. They, who from time immemorial looked upon every soldier as an enemy, either come out openly in the ranks of the anti-Japanese people's army or support by other means the fighters for national freedom. New strata of the peasantry continue to overcome the old passivity, take part in the organization and democratization of the people and the great process from which a nation is emerging. Undoubtedly the past weighs heavily on every step that is taken and the old prejudices and bad traditions are still powerful, but the new gains ground day by day, the nation grows and is becoming consolidated.

In the fire of the war for freedom millions are not only learning to defend themselves, weapon in hand, they are also learning the significance of democratic organization and of education. They are learning to read and write. Their offensive against the Japanese robbers is simultaneously an offensive against the national division, against backwardness and lack of culture. The Chinese people are becoming an active, independent factor in history.

In some examples taken from the national-revolutionary mass work in North China we will show how the Chinese people are consolidating themselves as a nation, are organizing and democratizing themselves, and how from this there grows a revolutionary patriotism, a national consciousness and an understanding of common interests.

The anti-Japanese war of defense in North China, which is an important strategic point in the war situation, has enriched the Chinese people with a great experience in revolutionary mass work. If it has been possible to win significant victories in North China, to reconquer wide areas and to create an anti-Japanese basis, the explanation is to be found in the mobilization of the masses of the people. Only if all of the progressive forces of the country gather together and are organized is it possible to win a final victory in the anti-Japanese war and to create a new state on the basis of the three principles of Sun Yat-sen.

THE FURY OF THE JAPANESE ROBBERS IN NORTH CHINA

The outrages practised by the Japanese militarists in the part of China which they have captured have aroused the entire people and have filled them with an intense hatred of the murderers. The Japanese burned down all the villages in that huge, thickly-populated area of Paoting to Shichiachang, along the Peiping-Hankow railway up to a distance of fifteen li from both sides of the railway. As is well known the Japanese

officers and soldiers violate all women whom they are able to seize. Even old women are no exception. In many cases small girls are raped, after which as a rule they die.

In the area between the Peiping-Hankow railway, Tientsin-Pukow Railway, Peiping-Suiyuan Railway and Tsengting-Taiyuan Railway, Japanese aggression has claimed not less than ten million victims, who have been put to death!

This unexampled, horrible fury of the Japanese murderers has called forth a great wave of indignation among the people. Moreover, even in the most backward districts the people rise spontaneously against the Japanese bandits. In this hard struggle against the robber invaders the people are continually resorting to new methods of struggle.

The Japanese soldiers often go to the villages for the sole purpose of violating the women. In order to entice and then punish the Japanese soldiers the men put on brightly colored women's clothes. The disguised Chinese then hasten away to an arranged place, followed by the Japanese women hunters, who are then handled as they deserve. There are many such cases. "The men put on women's clothes and fight in this way." The population of Shichiachang deprived the Japanese, in this manner, of hundreds of guns and armed an entire partisan detachment.

On another occasion the Japanese sent cavalry and a motorized detachment against a Chinese partisan detachment which was operating in the province of Hupeh. The partisans, learning of this, collected from the population a number of old sickles which they stuck firmly into the streets, so that the sharp edge was placed upwards. After that they covered up the sickles with sand. When the Japanese motorized detachment came driving down the street, one tire after the other was punctured and the cars could go no further. The partisans received the cavalry in the following manner: they planted nails with points upwards along the road which the Japanese had to take. The horses of the Japanese trod on the nails, wounded their hooves and in this way the troopers were dealt with. Since then the following proverb has been circulated: "We beat motors with old scythes and cavalry with nails."

The deep hatred against the Japanese robbers has spread even to the most distant regions of Northern China, where the people still worship idols. In their naive belief that through religious rites disaster can fall on the heads of the Japanese robbers these people make little figures of the devil from meal, which are intended to represent the Japanese. These figures are then cooked and eaten to the accompaniment of the following song:

From ground rice
And from wheaten flour
We cook the Japanese devil.
We eat the hands
And we eat the legs
But the heads
We give to the dog.

Many such episodes have become widely known among the people in the form of stories and songs.

The people of North China also take the initiative in sabotaging and destroying the enemy's lines of communication. They attack Japanese garrisons and do not leave the enemy in peace for a single moment. The masses carefully keep news about the position of the Chinese troops secret, track down traitors and help the Chinese People's Army to draw in new fighters, take care of food supplies, etc. In this growth of the anti-Japanese, patriotic sentiment and activity of the masses revolutionary mass work has been an essential factor.

THE MASS WORK OF THE ORGANIZATIONS AND THE VARIOUS STRATA OF THE POPULATION

The peasants form more than 80 per cent of the population of China. And obviously, in a long war of national liberation, they play an extremely important role, one can even say the decisive role.

In North China there are peasant organizations everywhere. These organiza-

tions give moral and material help to the families of the fighters. They mobilize the peasants to increase agricultural production. Thanks to this mass work among the peasants the 1938 harvest in North China was about 20 to 25 per cent larger than the previous year. Also, the price of the agricultural products has been considerably reduced and all this is entirely due to the improvement of the work performed, of productivity and the consequent higher yield of the soil.

The peasants go willingly into the army. They join up with the army of self-defense, as it is called, and the medical corps which give extremely active assistance to the regular army. The peasants expose the traitors to the fatherland, help the army in the organization of its transport, etc. They display great activity in the fight against the Japanese spies. In a document of the Japanese staff, which fell into the hands of the Chinese fighters for liberation, we find the admission that "of some dozen spies who had been sent to Wutaishan in order to obtain necessary information, not one has returned. All were captured."

Thanks to the activity of the mass organizations of the peasants in North China successful work has been carried out in the education of the masses and the raising of their national consciousness. The population knows already what the state needs and what the enemy needs. For example, the peasants in the provinces of Hupeh and Shansi no longer cultivate cotton and oil as the Japanese need these products, but produce the grain which is needed to increase the food supplies of the army and population.

Unfortunately, it has to be stated that the political mass work among the industrial workers is not as well organized as the work among the peasants. This is to be explained by the fact that the big towns and railways are in the hands of the Japanese, and in this way the big industrial centers, where the strength of the workers was concentrated, have been lost.

But the workers of those areas which have been occupied by the invaders continue to carry on resolute resistance. Thus we see that in June, 1938, 5,000 workers of Tangshan organized a rising behind the Japanese lines and succeeded in destroying two Japanese battalions and capturing many rifles and other weapons. The initiators and leaders of the rising were members of the Kuomintang and the Communist Party. Some were killed during the course of the heroic struggle against the Japanese. The workers of Tangshan have now organized several partisan detachments, which number about 10,000 men and operate on the borders of the provinces of Hopei and Chahar, in Chao-yang, Shan Hai-kwan and in the eastern part of the province of Hopei.

The youth in North China is organized in different associations, the most important being the "Society for the Saving of the Country" and the "Anti-Japanese Youth League." These organizations carry on a great deal of work not only among the youth but also among adults and children.

Youth choruses travel in the various districts of North China where they present their anti-Japanese songs and recitations. And now as a result of these choruses the workers, in those districts from which the invaders have been driven out have already learned these patriotic songs. This fact plays no small role in the mobilization of the masses in the struggle against the Japanese aggressors.

The dramatic circles of the youth perform patriotic plays, such as, *The Eight Hundred Fighters, Elegy on the Sufferings of the Country, Victory Is Certain* and *The New State Has Been Created*, etc. These plays strengthen the belief of the people in victory and mobilize the masses for tasks of social importance and increase the productivity of labor. The work of the dramatic circles raises the cultural level of the peasants.

The army of culture is the name given to the youth groups which work among the workers, peasants, women and children in order to overcome illiteracy. The activities of the cultural army are not

only useful in the armed resistance to Japan, they are also extremely important in the building up of the new state.

Half of the population of China consists of women, of whom there are more than two hundred million. Unfortunately, most of the women are still treated as slaves. Although the government has published a number of decrees about the rights of women, the majority of the women in China remain as they were in the past, backward and without rights. The women of North China, where the terrible custom of binding the feet still persists, are in a particularly difficult situation.

The women can bring about their complete emancipation and the fulfilment of their special demands only in common with the national liberation of China. The same road which leads to the liberation of the women leads to the liberation of the entire Chinese nation. In North China the progressive women have shown exemplary heroism in the armed resistance to Japan and in so doing have vigorously counteracted that neglect of women, the attitude of condemning them to the house and kitchen.

In North China, where wounded soldiers are usually looked after in private houses, the Chinese women show a truly self-sacrificing care for the wounded and sick fighters of the Chinese army. The women and their families often deny themselves the most necessary foodstuffs in order to give them to the wounded so that they will be restored to health as quickly as possible. Many women convince their husbands and sons that they should join the army. They make boots, knit stockings and gloves and send them to the front. They take over the patronage of detachments of the revolutionary people's army.

The women are taking more and more part in social and political life. In North China there are many women who have already been elected to the village and district councils and these as a rule enjoy an authority among the entire population.

All over North China there are children's organizations "For the Saving of the Country." The educational work among the children heightens their national consciousness, raises their cultural level and fills them with an anti-Japanese revolutionary patriotism. The children take part in choruses and dramatic circles and in this way participate in the agitation for resistance to Japan. They make good scouts and guides and they watch suspicious people.

On one occasion, children discovered the plans of the enemy to use poison gas against our troops. There is a young fellow working with the staff of the Eighth Revolutionary People's Army, who captured a spy just as he was about to throw poison down a well.

"Committees of the Families Connected with the Army" are to be found everywhere in North China, a committee taking in either one village or consisting of the representatives of families of several neighboring villages. The committees meet every day and discuss the requirement of the families of the soldiers. Educational and propaganda work is carried on systematically among these families.

Care is taken to see that the social position of the soldiers' families and their prestige among the people are improved. In the villages social groups are built which help these families in the tilling of their land and in the gathering of the harvest. The families of the soldiers also receive loans, the district leaders and other representatives of the authorities personally visit families whose relations are in the army, and decorate them with badges of honor. The families of the fighters enjoy a number of privileges. Their children receive education, the cooperatives allow them a large rebate on merchandise, etc.

In North China, in addition to the general schools in every village there are special circles for the liquidation of illiteracy, evening schools, etc. There are also cultural halls in every village and district "For the Saving of the Country," "National Revolutionary" rooms have also been set up, for "National Rebirth," etc. Specially selected comrades are sent to work in these organizations. They or-

ganize meetings at which reports are given about the situation at the front and the people are informed about the most heroic deeds of the soldiers and the self-sacrificing attitude of the people in the struggle against the Japanese invaders.

THE FIGHT AGAINST TRAITORS AND THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE ENEMY'S ARMY

One of the most important tasks is the struggle against traitors. The Chinese traitors conceal themselves in various ways behind anti-Japanese slogans, form "anti-Japanese" organizations and corps of soldiers, in order to spread disillusionment among the masses in the strength of the people, the spirit of defeatism and capitulation. They say: "Our troops will not be able to defeat the Japanese army. We must defend only ourselves. If the Japanese do not attack us then we do not need to go against them." Backward elements are deceived in this way and these treacherous speeches find a response among them.

The traitors to the fatherland also circulate slogans such as: "We will have nothing to do with either Japanese or Chinese soldiers." In this way the Japanese invaders seek to achieve a double purpose: the Chinese troops will meet with resistance from their own people and the Japanese will not have to send troops into the district, a task which usually they have difficulty in performing. Thus the Japanese invaders seek to carry out their plan of the "Suppression of China by the Chinese themselves."

The Japanese and their agents have circulated the following slogan in North China: "From partial peace to full peace." They declare that they are already prepared to conclude a mutual pact of non-aggression with the Chinese people and in this way they try to overcome the difficulties which the tenacious resistance of the Chinese people have caused them. They say: "Our troops will not kill, rob, burn down houses, violate women, and the people on their side must guarantee that the Chinese army will not attack the Japanese." In reality the aggressors need this "peace" in order to reduce the number of their troops in the occupied districts and to keep more troops at the front.

In order to prevent the coming together of the anti-Japanese forces and to break the militant spirit of the people, the enemy resorts to all kinds of provocation.

By means of terror and bribery they try to change the attitude of the people towards the Japanese army. In order to destroy the friendly relations between the Chinese people's army and the people the traitors from the "Army for the Support of the Emperor" often disguise themselves as soldiers from the Eighth Revolutionary People's Army and carry posters calling for the establishment of Soviet power, the carrying through of an agrarian revolution, the proletarian dictatorship, etc. The traitors tell the soldiers of the Central government that they are not against the regular army but they are against the Communists and the partisans. But to the partisans they say they are not against the partisans but against the regular army.

The national revolutionary army of China and the population of North China have already learned how to recognize the enemy. But there are some people who do not see through the devilish machinations of the enemy. One of the most decisive tasks of mass work is to make clear to these people the scoundrelly tricks of the Japanese invaders.

The Eighth Revolutionary People's Army and the other revolutionary people's armies of North China endeavor to carry on political work within the pro-Japanese organizations and armies and only when this is not successful do they resort to the military destruction of these organizations and armies. In this connection great successes can already be recorded. "The First pro-Japanese Army for the Support of the Emperor" has been successfully disintegrated. The mutineer, Li Fu-ho, and his Japanese adviser were shot. The Second pro-Japanese Army was destroyed. The commander of the Second Army was killed

and two brigade commanders and two regimental commanders were taken prisoners. The Third pro-Japanese Army suffered such blows that the remnants of it are now stuck in Shichiachang and barely dare to show their faces. The other armies of this character have either gone over to the Chinese people's army or have been destroyed.

All these victories are the result of a firm national consciousness and determined organizational, propagandist and military work, the result of the deep hatred felt by the people towards the traitors and the puppet "government."

* * *

An important factor is the anti-war sentiment of the Japanese soldiers. In those places where the Japanese troops gather, leaflets are distributed and anti-Japanese posters put up. Slogans in Japanese are called out to the Japanese soldiers.

Friendly political talks are carried on with the prisoners. Many of them are won over to the cause of freedom.

Deserters state that this agitation among the soldiers of the Japanese army is finding a response and that the anti-war feeling is growing among them. The Japanese troops at the front no longer fight with the same spirit as they did at the beginning of the war. In almost every fight Japanese soldiers allow themselves to be taken prisoners, something which rarely took place before. Desertion from the armies of the puppet "government" has now become a usual occurrence.

All of this proves that it is possible to win over to the side of the Chinese fighters for national liberation not only armies of the puppet "government" but also whole detachments of the Japanese.

The Chinese people's army has already developed to a high level of national consciousness and is therefore in a position to work in the closest possible connection with the masses of the people. For the first time in the history of China the army is part of the flesh and blood of the people.

THE PERSPECTIVES

From a military-strategical and economic standpoint, North China is of great importance to the Japanese robbers. That is why the Japanese militarists cling so tightly to it. There is no doubt that the Japanese invaders want to establish themselves firmly and will therefore make repeated efforts to drive the Chinese people's army out of North China. Therefore the following are the main aspects of the next tasks:

1. The enemy will open an offensive against some of the districts occupied by the Chinese people's army. The enemy will strive to gain possession of certain strategic positions.

2. The enemy will endeavor by all means in his power to block the means of communication of the Chinese people's army in order to destroy the connection between the separate detachments.

3. The enemy will increase his acts of provocation and his attempts to deceive the masses with the object of breaking up the anti-Japanese national front.

It is necessary to bear in mind that the Northern front is the one that will finally decide the war. In North China there are more than fifteen Japanese divisions. The revolutionary people's army is striving to divert here still more forces of the enemy. It is resolved to take upon itself the heaviest responsibilities in order to facilitate the resistance which is going on throughout China.

The tenacious resistance in North China will make it impossible for the Japanese to draw on the rich material resources of that region, and their plan for the "Suppression of China by the Chinese themselves" and the utilization of the resources of China for the struggle against China will come to nothing.

A strong resistance in North China will also render great assistance to those sections of the Chinese people's army which are fighting in the rear of the enemy and which are succeeding in turning the rear of the enemy into a front.

The armed resistance to the Japanese invaders in North China is a part of the national war of liberation in the whole of

China. The forces of the Eighth Revolutionary People's Army, like the Manchurian voluntary army, are operating in order to split up the forces of the enemy.

The army and the people of North China, which has a population of approximately one hundred million, can look back on a rich experience of struggle during a period of almost two years. During the course of the struggle great progress has been made. In the army there is firm discipline. Friendly relations have been established between the army and the people. There has also been some improvement in the life of the people. The struggle has brought North China along the road of progress. It has educated the people in the spirit of determination and created a firm belief in victory.

The firm, collective leadership of the anti-Japanese struggle by the Kuomintang, the Communist Party and the other anti-Japanese parties and groups stands as an example before the masses and is the surest method of bringing about victory.

The most important thing is to maintain the unity of the entire people and the close cooperation between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party. Should anyone try to stand in the way of the unity and forward march of the nation they will be thrown aside by the powerful stream of the anti-Japanese people's movement.

"New grand and impressive prospects are opening up before our Party; new great and complex tasks are confronting it. If it is to accomplish these tasks and perform its role of vanguard fighter in the building of a communist society, our Party must ceaselessly sharpen its organizational weapon. The Party Rules adopted by our Congress will be the Rules of the Party of victorious socialism, Rules which will arm our Party members for the successful accomplishment of the task of gradual transition to communism."—A. Zhdanov, *The Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, p. 78.

Fascist Agitation in the Near East

BY D. DAVOS

THE fascist aggressors are continuously preparing for the "big war." They want to redraw the map of the world by force. They demand colonies.

"It is no longer a question of competition in the markets of a commercial war, of dumping. These methods of struggle have long been recognized as inadequate. It is now a question of a new redivision of the world, of spheres of influence and colonies, by military action."*

German fascism demands not only the return of its former colonies, it stretches out its bloody claws towards the lands which have for a long time belonged to England and France. Italian fascism wants to reign over the whole of the Mediterranean, from Gibraltar to Turkey; it wants to bring into its possession the Red Sea and extend its dominance to the Indian Ocean.

In preparation for the "big war" the fascist aggressors want to destroy the ways of communication of England, and France, rendering unusable the most important military and strategic points which defend them. To reach these ends, they have unleashed intensive fascist propaganda, espionage and wrecking throughout the whole vast Mediterranean region, from Gibraltar to the straits of Bab el Mandeb.

* * *

Hitler and Mussolini have, for a long time, collaborated in their agitational activity in the Near East, the former having resurrected the old "Berlin-Baghdad" plan of German imperialism, the latter possessed by the dream of "the Greater Roman Empire."

Cairo, in Egypt, is one of the centers of the Italian-German fascist agents in the Near East. At a meeting of fascist agents in Cairo, a plan was drawn up for agitational work in the countries of the Near East. The German Ministry of Propaganda assigns £3,000 sterling monthly for fascist propaganda in Egypt.

The Egyptian cotton and the fertile valley of the Nile disturb the sleep of Hitler and Mussolini. Mussolini adorned himself with a turban out of "love for cotton," and the agents of Hitler parade as ardent supporters of Islam, demagogically declaring that the Mohammedan religion is "higher than the Christian," and that "lately in Germany many people were converted to the Mohammedan creed."

The fascist agents are very active in Svria and Palestine. The latter belongs to the system of fortified strategic points on the lines of communication of the British Empire and the oil pipe-line from Mossul and Haifa runs through Palestine. Recently, especially in March and April, the attacks on that line have multiplied. The pipes were broken and the oil set afire. The examination of the wreckers proved that this work was led by Italian officers.

In Iraq the fascist agents concentrate their activities in the oil districts. They attempt to bring under their influence the tribes living in these districts. Very often fascist agents say: "The oil districts of Iraq are a second Sudetenland."

The fascist aggressors pay considerable attention to Yemen. Mecca has be-

---

* Joseph Stalin, *From Socialism to Communism in the Soviet Union*, p. 9. International Publishers, New York.

come the place of pilgrimage for fascist agents. The Italian and Japanese agents in Yemen conduct a particularly intensive agitation in the vicinity of the straits of Bab of Mandeb. Japanese and Italian military instructors are assisting in the reorganization of the army of the king of Yemen. Last year a treaty was concluded between Japan and Yemen for the supply of Japanese arms to Yemen. Japan also obtained a concession for the establishment of an air-link between Japan and Yemen. Last year the son of the king of Yemen was in Tokyo and as a result of this visit a commercial treaty was concluded between the two countries. The aim of Japanese imperialism in Yemen is to paralyze the British lines of communication with India.

* * *

Hundreds of Gestapo and Ovra agents carry out their work of agitation in Turkey, Egypt, Palestine, Yemen, Iraq, and Iran under the guise of tourists, correspondents, engineers, technicians, scientists, tradesmen, bank-clerks, importing secretly and openly into these countries arms for their gangs of bandits, distributing fascist literature, etc.

The fascist aggressors use for their disruptive and espionage work in the Near East quite a number of women in the capacity of dancers, teachers, governesses, typists, dressmakers. According to the Turkish press, in Egypt alone 300 such women agents have already been discovered, one hundred and fifty in Syria, two hundred in Persia and over forty in Iraq. These women agents are first of all trained in a special course of six months in Hamburg and then sent with false passports to the Near East as Czech or Hungarian girls. They try particularly to penetrate into political circles and into the homes of influential people. In Turkey it has become fashionable in aristocratic homes to have "German governesses." Now there are so many such "governesses" that public opinion puts the pointed question: Where does the work of governesses end and espionage activity begin?

Fascist agents carry out anti-Semitic propaganda in the Near Eastern countries. The German consul in Damascus (Syria) pays out enormous sums for anti-Semitic agitation and for the organization of Jewish pogroms. In Syria and Palestine anti-Semitic leaflets printed in Berlin are distributed. In these leaflets Roosevelt is branded as a "protector of Jews."

Hitler's book *Mein Kampf* has been translated into Arabic and is being distributed by agents of German fascism in Arabian countries as the "New Koran." Obviously the parts of the book where the Arabs are referred to as an inferior race were omitted. The result of fascist propaganda is already making itself felt in a sharpening of relations between the Arabian and Jewish population, which in Palestine has taken the form of bloody internecine struggle. The work of disruption in Arabian countries is being conducted by the Mohammedan department of the Berlin propaganda minister, Mr. Goebbels.

On the shores of the Mediterranean in Lebanon (Syria) there is a small town called Hunije of eight hundred inhabitants. It is the center of the espionage and disruptive work and the general headquarters of fascist agents in the Near East. Here congregate the most reactionary elements of all Arabian countries. Here lives the Mufti of Palestine who sold himself to fascism; here lives the embittered reactionary Egyptian exviceroy Abbas Hilmi; here live the sons and uncles of Turkish sultans and Persian shahs and hundreds of other reactionaries who fled from Turkey and Iran. The German and Italian agents visit these people quite frequently, start countless intrigues and have already appointed candidates for the kingships of Lebanon, Palestine, etc. Here were prepared the plans for the dismemberment of Syria; here were organized the rising of Kurdish tribes in Iraq.

German and Italian fascism, with the help of their agents, try to penetrate into the political parties of the Arabian

countries, paying especially attention to the winning of youth. Some of the reactionary parties in the Near East exist solely on the subventions of German and Italian fascism. For instance, the nationalist party and the Usbe party in Syria, the party of Mufti in Palestine, the organization of the blueshirts in Egypt, exist solely on the sums of money received from Berlin and Rome.

The president of the Syrian nationalist party, Anton Sada, recently paid a visit to Berlin and, after his interview with Goebbels, returned with a large sum of money. At one of the meetings of the leadership of the Mufti party, a representative of German fascism, I. Davase, declared that "further money and arms would be forthcoming from Germany." In February of this year a shipment containing 500 German rifles and a large quantity of war material was detained on its way to Lebanon. A group of members of the Usbe party were recently arrested in Syria. In the proceedings it was ascertained that they were in the pay of Italian fascism, "worked" on instructions received direct from Rome and were supplied with arms from the same source.

The so-called clubs are one of the channels through which the fascist propaganda and disruptive work penetrate into the Arabian countries. Everywhere, under different names, fascist "clubs" are being formed. At their head are men who have been specially trained either in Germany or Italy. Most of the members of these "clubs" are local officials. Recently in a search carried out in the house of one of the founders of a local "club" in Damascus, eighteen rifles, ten revolvers, many bombs, cartridges and instructions were found, all received from Berlin. In Syria and other countries Italian fascism opens "clubs" under the name "Casa Italiana."

Besides these "clubs," fascist agents also utilized for their propaganda the press, leaflets and the radio. In Syria alone nine newspapers are published with the financial backing of Germany and Italy. Berlin supplies special information in Arabic for these newspapers. The Italian broadcasting station in Bari calls on the Arabian people, in their own language, to rise against England and France and daily praises very highly the fascist regime so hateful to the common people. In addition to this broadcasting station a secret radio station has started working recently, calling upon its listeners to fight against anti-fascists and Communists. It was ascertained that this station constantly changes its location, working in the region between Syria and Palestine.

The fascist agents zealously try to recruit the local population for their work of disruption. The Italian consulates in the Arabian countries invite the local residents and by all kinds of enticements, induce them to travel to Rome where they are trained in espionage work. The German fascist agents send the people recruited in the Arabian countries to Berlin for training. In this manner cadres are created for espionage and wrecking work in the countries of the Near East.

In addition to this "activity," the German and Italian fascists open espionage centers in Syria, Egypt and other countries under the cover of cultural work, schools, libraries, hospitals and other "cultural" undertakings.

* * *

In spite of this intensive propaganda, disruption and espionage work, the foreign aggressors were unable to win sympathy and support in the Arabian countries of the Near East and they will not succeed in obtaining it in the future. Their agents, who stir up national hatred between Arabs and Jews leading to pogroms with bloodshed, who lead infamous propaganda against all anti-fascists, especially against Communists, who organize assassinations and wrecking, encounter nothing but hatred and contempt of the greater part of the local population.

Fascist expectations that the struggle for national liberation of the Arabian people would bring grist to their mill have not come true. The people of Syria and Palestine will never forget the bes-

tiality and degradation of German militarists during the world imperialist war. How many of the best representatives of the Arabian people were executed by German imperialism and its agents, the Turkish pashas! The Arabs will never forget it!

Neither will the Arabian people forget the yoke and oppression of Italian imperialism; the population of Tripoli (Libya) will not forget its barbarism and the oppressive rule which they have experienced on their own backs for the last twenty-eight years. The methods by which Italians conquered Tripoli and the aims they pursued were already pointed out by Lenin in 1912:

"Italy has 'won.' A year ago she threw herself on the Turkish district in Africa with intentions of plunder, and from now on, Tripoli will belong to Italy. It is worth while to cast a glance at this typical colonial war of a 'civilized' state in the twentieth century.

"What was the cause of this war? The greed of Italian finance magnates and capitalists who needed a new market and success for Italian imperialism.

"What was this war? A highly perfected civilized slaughter of human beings, of the crushing of the Arabs with the aid of the 'newest' weapons....

"About 14,800 Arabs were killed. In truth the war will go on in spite of the 'peace,' for the Arab tribes in the heart of the African continent far from the Coast will not submit. They will 'civilize' them for a long time with the bayonet, the bullet, the whip, with fire and rape."*

This rule of "the bayonet, the bullet, the whip, with fire and rape" has been in force in Tripoli for the last twenty-eight years. The Arab population of Tripoli cannot and will not submit itself to the rule of the Italian oppressors. The risings of the people of Tripoli in 1914-1918, 1921, 1927, and 1930 are clear indications of this fact. According to the Turkish press, the Italian punitive expeditions have killed in Tripoli more than 260,000 Arabs. The population of Tripoli has decreased from 750,000 to 520,000. The devastating fascist bombers have razed to the ground hundreds of villages and small towns. For every four inhabitants of Tripoli there is one Italian soldier. Italian imperialism brought to Tripoli hunger, death and inquisition.

In spite of the bloody terror, the population of Tripoli continues to fight courageously against Italian fascism. The descendants of the ancient leaders of the Senussi tribe are at present fighting with arms in their hands against Mussolini's barbarism. At the time of the subjugation of Albania by Italy the Senussi tribes rallied to a new rising which is still growing. The rebels proclaim in their manifesto: "Beware of the deceitful policy of the Italians who want to use our sons dressed up in uniforms of Lybian soldiers as cannon fodder in their wars of conquest."

Mussolini proclaims himself as the "defender" of Islam. Yet in Syria in the streets of Damascus 35,000 people demonstrated in connection with the occupation of Albania with the cries: "Down with Mussolini! Mussolini is not the protector but the enslaver of Islam!" These slogans resounded throughout Egypt and Tunis. Five thousand Egyptians in Palestine declared their determination to fight against the penetration of German and Italian fascism into the Arabian countries and to defend Egypt against the attacks of the fascist aggressors.

All democratic parties including Communists in Syria, Lebanon, Palestine and Egypt concluded a united front for freedom and democracy and against the penetration of fascist aggressors into the Arabian countries.

On May 7 a conference was held in Beyrouth of the anti-fascists of Syria and Lebanon. At this conference methods and means of struggle against the penetration of fascism into the Arabian countries were discussed.

The anti-fascist people's movement, embracing varied classes of the population of the Arabian countries is gradually broadening into a mighty national united front struggle against fascism. In Syria, Egypt and Palestine there were

*V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXX, p. 201. Russian ed.

powerful protest demonstrations against the intrigues of Hitler and Mussolini in the Near East. In spite of it the reactionary French and English colonial rulers and the local authorities are increasing the persecution of the common people. For instance, when the workers and townspeople in a number of Syrian towns conducted a protest strike against the provocations of pro-fascist elements, the French authorities opened fire on the demonstration in the streets of Aleppo and Demascus. Thousands of anti-fascists were arrested who called out "Alliance with the English and French workers and common people for a struggle against fascism!"

There are many known cases when the local authorities increase the persecution of the population in answer to its demand for the expulsion of fascist agents and for the protection of democratic liberties, thus encouraging the reactionary forces.

This anti-democratic policy assists the undermining activities of fascist agents and reactionaries in Arabian countries. The fight of the common people against fascism is closely linked up with the fight for democratic liberties. Notwithstanding threats and persecution the anti-fascist masses wage a decisive struggle against the aggressors and for the unity of the Arabian people. The united progressive forces of the Arabian people will put up a decisive resistance to the intrigues of Hitler and Mussolini in the Near East.

"Democracy and Socialism"

BY P. DENGEL

ARTHUR ROSENBERG, Professor of History at Berlin University until the setting up of the fascist dictatorship in Germany, has published a new book called *Democracy and Socialism*. Professor Rosenberg, who is a member of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, in this book criticizes the policy of his party, especially its policy at the time of the Weimar Republic, and he also criticizes the current policy of the Second International and such reactionary Social-Democratic leaders as Spaak, Citrine and others. But he robs his criticism of its value by distorting the real course of history in his book and by taking up an attitude in important questions that comes close to the attitude of the Trotskyites.

Following the defeat of German imperialism, Arthur Rosenberg attached himself to the revolutionary working class movement and entered the Communist Party. Here he soon joined with Maslow and Ruth Fischer, with whose support he was elected to the Central Committee of the K.P.D. (Communist Party of Germany) in 1924. With Scholem and Korsch he was one of the organizers of the Ultra-Left faction, which disagreed with the tactic of the united front and made use of the anti-Bolshevist phraseology of the Trotskyites. In 1925 Arthur Rosenberg was expelled from the ranks of the K.P.D. on account of his opportunist, Trotskyist and anti-Leninist ideas. Some years later he joined the Social-Democratic Party and became professor of history at Berlin University. His book shows that he still holds views which originate from his Trotskyist record and are calculated to mislead the working class and weaken the fight against the fascist enemy.

In this article we wish to confine ourselves to posing correctly a few important questions dealt with by Rosenberg.

The first question concerns his treatment of the pre-war history of the European working class movement. According to Prof. Rosenberg, Marx and Engels were mistaken in assuming the European, and especially the German, working class movement which was developing under their leadership to be revolutionary. In reality this working class movement was still an expression of guild-liberalism, and only on the surface did it adopt revolutionary Marxist ideology.

Arthur Rosenberg's mistake here, which leads to a complete misconception of history, lies in the fact that he gives general application to isolated phenomena and tendencies in the evolution of the working class movement up to the death of Engels, and overlooks its essential core. For the essential fact was that the workers founded their own independent political party, *their class party*, and freed themselves from the political leadership of the bourgeoisie.

The fight of Marx and Engels against Proudhonism, against Lassalle and Schweitzer, against pure trade unionism and against anarchism, was waged precisely on this point: the independence of the political movement of the working class, freed from bourgeois leadership and bourgeois influence. This struggle was carried on by Marx and Engels as long as they lived. Despite their in-

ternal weakness, although the class consciousness of the workers was as yet insufficiently developed, the Social-Democratic parties of this period were nonetheless class parties, which were persecuted by the bourgeoisie for their revolutionary policy of class struggle, and not for using pseudo-revolutionary phrases.

Certainly, in the period from Engels' death to 1914 the Social-Democratic parties degenerated. At the party congresses and international congresses the revolutionary program was upheld and avowed afresh, but petty-bourgeois democrats, social reformers, and economist-minded trade union leaders captured the key positions in the parties—the parliamentary fractions, newspaper editorships, leadership of the unions, etc. The policy of the Social-Democratic parties was laid down more and more by these elements, who got the machinery of the parties and trade unions into their hands and by methods of formal democracy shut out the will of the workers. The fatal mistake of such leaders as August Bebel, who held to their conviction of the necessity for the class struggle and the proletarian revolution, was that they subordinated themselves to the reformists "in the interests of unity," instead of joining with the workers to take up the fight against those who were carrying the germ of the decomposition of their parties; that the superficial advance made them underestimate the internal decline.

Arthur Rosenberg asserts in his book that the revisionists, "in order to vindicate their practical and peaceful immediate policy," were "compelled" to fight against the dogmatic Marxism prevailing at the time. He says that really the revisionists "were the better Marxists," "since Marx always stood for the utilizing of the actual political possibilities by the workers."

But in fact the revisionists conducted their struggle not against the dogmatic distorting, vulgarizing and undermining of Marxism, but against all its fundamental revolutionary doctrines. They denied the sharpening of class contradictions, they denied the inevitable increasing misery of the urban middle strata and the process of proletarianization of broad masses of peasants under capitalism. From this they deduced the impossibility of the proletarian revolution and advocated reconciling the interests of the exploited classes with those of the exploiters. The further result of this conception was the preaching of collaboration of the Social-Democratic Party with the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois parties, and the subordination of the Social-Democratic Party to the "general national interest," supposedly represented by the bourgeois-capitalist state. In absolute contradiction to the doctrine of Marx and Engels and in contradiction to the Social-Democratic Party, the revisionists represented the idea of turning the labor party into a party of liberal and national reform.

Rosenberg declares in his book that the revisionists favored a "peaceful immediate policy." But it became clear that their policy was altogether incompatible with the struggle to maintain peace. In fact, the pacifism of the revisionists was nothing but a rotten mask. For example, take foreign policy as pictured by the leading organ of the revisionists, the *Socialist Monthly*. To be sure, from the point of view of the interests of the German imperialist bourgeoisie the anti-British "continental policy" advocated therein was a more sensible "realist policy" than the policy of the pan-Germans and of Kaiser Wilhelm II. But this "continental policy" of the *Socialist Monthly* was a capitalist-imperialist policy and not a revolutionary-proletarian peace policy. This becomes even clearer when we take note of the support by the people of the *Socialist Monthly* for the acquisition of colonies. Evidently the revisionists did not correctly see the "real character" of the imperialist period. "Yet the decisive point is that they themselves had imperialist ideas in the interest of their own national bourgeoisie, and never even gave a thought to a revolutionary struggle of the working class against the war."

It is just the same with Prof. Rosenberg's assertion that the revisionists were "better Marxists" for having, in accordance with the teaching of Marx, urged the utilizing of "actual political possibilities" by the workers. Take a look here at the agrarian policy of the spokesman of the German revisionists in agrarian matters, Eduard David. This "better Marxist" demanded from the Social-Democratic Party an agrarian policy which met the interests of the large peasants (and the big landowners), but not those of the mass of working peasants. Such a policy prevented the possible collaboration with the peasant masses who were subjected to the severest economic pressure and threatened with disaster. Such an agrarian policy certainly was not "the utilizing of the actual political possibilities by the workers," but was an attempt to harness the workers to the interests of a section of the bourgeoisie. Later, under the Weimar Republic, it was this sort of Social-Democratic agrarian policy that drove the radicalized, impoverished peasant masses into the arms of fascism. Moreover, the transition of the reformist trade union leaders to bureaucratic methods of "struggle," their deliberate neglect to organize the unskilled and semi-skilled masses of workers, their tendency to make the trade unions a "profession" for a privileged section of the workers—all this crippled the possible growth of the workers' organizations and lessened the power of every section of the working class.

From every aspect the work of the reformists and revisionists was pernicious and disastrous for the working class movement.

Up to this point one can give Prof. Rosenberg credit for being simply mistaken. But one has to withdraw this benevolent explanation when he makes the following declarations in his book: The Soviet state, as Lenin envisaged it, and as it seemed to be growing in the practical course of the revolution, he says, was actually "a revival of the communal type of democracy." Since 1921 Lenin is declared to have given up all hope of a victorious workers' revolution in any country outside Russia and for that reason to have started to retreat at home. In place of "self-government of the masses through their deputies" there came the "centralized dictatorship of the Bolshevist Party." In the Soviet Union the revolution has been paralyzed into "bureaucratic state capitalism."

Let us compare these assertions with the facts. Lenin very clearly expressed his thoughts on the proletarian state both before the October Revolution and afterwards. Rosenberg himself says that Lenin revived "original Marxism." Rosenberg further says that according to Marx, "the victorious proletariat had the task of immediately building a strong, fighting centralized government after the manner of Robespierre."

Professor Rosenberg knows Lenin's celebrated work, *State and Revolution*, perfectly well, and he cannot excuse himself with a plea of ignorance. In this book, written a few months *before* the revolution, Lenin upholds Marx's and Engels' attitude on "democratic centralism, on one indivisible republic."* In the same work Lenin talks of all citizens, in the first phase of communism, becoming the salaried employees of the state, of a state "syndicate" encompassing the whole people.**

After the October revolution, on March 7, 1918, Lenin said:

"The organization of accounting, of the control of large enterprises, the transformation of the whole of the state economic mechanism into a single, huge machine, into an economic organism that will work in such a way as to enable hundreds of millions of people to be guided by a single plan—such was the enormous organizational task that rested on our shoulders."***

Lenin does not say here that this task is already solved: seeing the disorgani-

---

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. III, pp. 66-68.

** *Ibid.*, p. 92.

*** *Ibid.*, p. 287.

zation resulting from the war, the backwardness of the country, and the economic anarchy which capitalism had left behind it, that was impossible in the course of a few months. Therefore Lenin spoke of a gigantic organizational task which still lay ahead.

Lenin always urged for the proletariat state a strict, centralized state power, led by a party of the working class organized along centralized lines. Lenin explains this necessity, first, by the task already quoted, of converting the chaotic economy which capitalism leaves behind as its inheritance into an organized, centrally-led economy, encompassing the whole country and the whole people, without exploiters and without exploitation.

Second, by the extreme sharpening of the class struggle after the conquest of power by the working class, when it takes on the form of civil war.

Third, that as a result of the unevenness of the development of the working class only *one* country has been victorious, and that it finds itself face to face with wholly inimical capitalist surroundings.

That Lenin at the same time envisaged the Soviet democratic state as a mighty development of local, district and municipal self-government is correct. Without the most pronounced development of the new, socialist democracy, without drawing in the largest possible numbers of the working class to take part in governing and leading the state, it would not have been possible to destroy the old state apparatus and build a new one, far less would it have been possible to put down the counter-revolution supported by the capitalists of the whole world, and the imperialist intervention.

But this powerful socialist democracy has nothing to do with the "revival of the communal type of democracy" as Prof. Rosenberg imagines. Prof. Rosenberg fashions himself a premise, which has really never existed, in order to proceed from it to "prove" something, to adjust and falsify history. For Rosenberg asserts that in 1921 Lenin, having lost hope of a victorious workers' revolution in any country, ordered a retreat at home and went over to a "centralist dictatorship" of the Bolshevik Party.

Prof. Rosenberg can read in the literature of the party to which he belongs how the assertion that in Soviet Russia there was not a dictatorship of the working class but a dictatorship of the Bolshevik Party was made as early as 1918 by the Mensheviks and the German Social-Democrats. When "radical" elements within the Communist International repeated this assertion, Lenin answered them in *Left Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder*:

"The mere presentation of the question—'dictatorship of the Party *or* the dictatorship of the class, the dictatorship (Party) of the leaders or the dictatorship (Party) of the masses?'—is evidence of the most incredible and hopeless confusion of mind. People try very hard to *invent* something out of the ordinary, and in their effort to be wise they become ridiculous. Everyone knows that the masses are divided into classes; that masses can be contrasted to classes only by contrasting the overwhelming majority in general, without dividing it according to position in the social system of production, to categories occupying a definite position in the social system of production; that usually, and in the majority of cases, in the modern civilized countries, at least, classes are led by political parties; that political parties, as a general rule, are directed by more or less stable groups composed of the most authoritative, influential and experienced members, who are elected to the most responsible positions and are called leaders. All this is ABC. All this is simple and clear. Why, instead of this, do we get all this rigmarole, this new Volapük?"*

Rosenberg is acquainted with these words of Lenin, written in the spring of 1920. It is not unknown to him that among Lenin's great historic achievements are numbered his doctrines on the role of the Party in the proletarian revolution and under the dictatorship of the proletariat, on the relations of Party and

* *Ibid.*, Vol. X, pp. 80-81.

class, of Party and masses, and so on. In these relations no fundamental change took place in the Soviet Union in 1921. It is true that with the introduction of the New Economic Policy a necessary change was instituted in the treatment of the peasantry, in order to consolidate the alliance of the working class with the main mass of the peasants on the new economic basis. Lenin also described the N.E.P. as a retreat, but never in the sense that Prof. Rosenberg makes out. As early as 1922 Lenin himself announced the launching of a new advance, one of intensified attack upon the positions remaining to capitalism. It is well known that this initiative of Lenin's ended under Stalin's leadership with the liquidation of the capitalist elements, the Nepmen and kulaks, as a class, and with the victory of socialism on the land as well. In refutation of Rosenberg's assertions it must be made clear that with the measures of 1921 a new stage was entered upon, of the revival of active participation by the working peasantry in the new socialist democracy. In a word, Rosenberg's whole thesis on the radical alteration of the political situation in the Soviet Union in 1921 is a fabrication. Prof. Rosenberg was unable to bring forward so much as the appearance of a proof in support of his thesis.

And now for Arthur Rosenberg's contention that the form of state in the Soviet Union is a "state-capitalist dictatorship," which exists also—in Turkey!

The very comparison of the Soviet Union with Turkey is an insult to the elementary intelligence of the reader. We share the view that Kemal's dictatorship in the post-war period fulfilled a progressive function, particularly because Kemal succeeded in assuring the national independence of Turkey and to a certain extent in repelling foreign imperialist influences by state-capitalist measures.

But what has all this in common with the gigantic, historic transformation in the Soviet Union?

Has private capital, the exploitation of man by man, been destroyed in the Soviet Union or not? Is it true that in the Soviet Union today, following the triumph of the collectivization of agriculture, the root from which new private capital, new exploitation of man by man, might spring has been destroyed—or is it not true? Does its economy, conducted according to a plan, operate for the profit of capitalists, or for the satisfaction of the needs of the working people? In whose hands is the leadership of economy and of the state, in the hands of capitalists and their deputies, or in the hands of the working people, of the Soviets elected by universal, equal and secret ballot?

To speak of state capitalism in a country where no capitalists and no private ownership of the means of production are left, where banks, industries, trade and land have been torn from the grip of the exploiters and the capitalists have been liquidated as a class, is unscrupulous.

Rosenberg omits to define in his book what he means by "state capitalism" and what by "socialism." At several points in the book he takes it on himself to defend Marxism against petty-bourgeois anarchism. So one must assume that Rosenberg rejects the idea of the petty-bourgeois anarchists that socialist society is nothing more than the sum of completely autonomous "socialist" units, which collaborate at most within narrow provincial limits. Self-administration of economy by the working people under socialism cannot be realized by anarchist methods, for it does not preclude central leadership, but demands it. Faced with a hostile capitalist outer world socialist society requires safeguarding by a strong state, by socialist democracy as realized in the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is clear to every honest Socialist—but people like Rosenberg make a systematic attempt to obscure this clarity. In whose interests? Certainly not in the interests of the working class, which rightly sees its strongest bulwark in the socialist state.

This applies in the same way to what Arthur Rosenberg says about the Communist International and the Communist Parties. He repeats the slander of the

fascists and the Trotskyites that the Communist Parties have grown into "propaganda societies for the Soviet government."

It was with this pitiful phrase that the anti-Bolshevik League came forward for the first time, shortly after the founding of the Communist International. Reactionary Social-Democratic leaders adopted the same slander into their vocabulary as early as 1920. When the workers no longer fell for this miserable deceit by the Deterdings and Citrines of every country, the Trotskyites took up the same threadbare phrase, and Arthur Rosenberg repeats it without the slightest attempt to substantiate his assertions.

The activity of the Communist Parties of the world is no secret. The world public knows them, and so does Prof. Rosenberg. We have, lying open to the world, the work of the Communist Party of Spain in recent years. Who in Spain was the most faithful champion of the united front and the People's Front? Who was it in Spain who promptly fought petty-bourgeois "benevolence" towards the fascist law-breakers? Who in Spain put into operation a rational policy for defending the republic? It was the Communist Party of Spain.

Open for the world to see, also, is the work of the Communist Party of France. Who was the initiator of the united front and Popular Front in France? Who fought against the shameful, anti-working class "non-intervention" policy? Who rallied the French people against the Munich capitulation? Only one party in France did that consistently and with firm determination, and that was the Communist Party of France.

Professor Rosenberg knows that the Communist Party of Germany is fighting under the difficult conditions of fascist dictatorship, as the only properly organized force against barbaric fascism, and is working constantly and stubbornly to gather and unify all the anti-fascist forces in Germany.

Who staked all in order to bind together the international working class for a united struggle in defense of Spain, China and Czechoslovakia? It was the Communist International. The saboteurs of this struggle sat in the ranks of the Second International.

But Professor Rosenberg is shocked that the Communist Parties make the workers and working people of all countries conscious of the irresistible strength of socialism as realized in the Soviet Union.

Yet the facts that in the socialist country industrial production has more than doubled in the course of five years (being 238.8 per cent in 1938 compared with 1933) and amounts to more than nine times the industrial production of prewar Russia, and that the growing wealth benefits the entire working population, as is shown by the growth of the volume of retail trade, of state and cooperative trade from 49,789,000,000 rubles in 1933 to 138,574,000,000 rubles—these facts give the working people of the whole world courage and strength, and help to bring them together and unify them. The same is equally true in all matters of culture.

Moreover, the policy of the Soviet Union relative to its capitalist surroundings lies open to view by all workers, working peoples and progressives. There is no contradiction between words and deeds where the government of the Soviet Union is concerned. This policy is determined by its aim of safeguarding peace by the linking of all people and states who want peace, and are prepared to defend it in a common front against the disturbers of peace, aggressors and provocateurs. It is also well known that the government of the Soviet Union stood by the Spanish people by deeds and not merely in words, whereas the governments of the "democratic" countries leagued themselves with the fascist thieves, also that the government of the Soviet Union is helping the Chinese people by deeds as well as in words; and also, that the government of the Soviet Union was prepared to defend the independence of Czechoslovakia.

All that fills the workers of the whole world with pride and confidence, puts hope into all working and progressive

people, and strengthens their struggle against the fascist war-makers and their accomplices.

But anyone who distorts and falsifies the picture of the Soviet Union, slandering its leaders, the Bolshevik Party, is helping the warmongers, helping fascism, helping the reactionaries in the "democratic" countries, and helping the agents of the enemy inside the ranks of the working class. It amounts to pure hypocrisy to "profess" in words—as Arthur Rosenberg does—support of the united and popular fronts, while in fact, by the contemptible way in which he talks of the Communist Parties and the Soviet Union, giving help to those reactionary elements among the Social-Democratic leaders who stubbornly persist in preventing the unification of the working class against fascism; and thereby sharing responsibility for the unspeakable sufferings of the peoples who have fallen under the yoke of fascism and are to be dragged, in fetters, into a new world war.

New Books

PAGES FROM A WORKER'S LIFE

By William Z. Foster

A stirring autobiography of a great American labor leader. By the author of "From Bryan to Stalin." 2.00

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE U.S.S.R.

By A. V. Shestakov

Winner of the second all-Union prize for the best textbook on this subject. An aid to the study of the **History of the C.P.S.U.** $ .85

AGAINST AGGRESSION

By Maxim Litvinov

Collection of speeches, together with text of international treaties and pacts. .75

THE GERMAN IDEOLOGY

By Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

One of the classics of Marxist theory; first time in English 2.00

NEW DATA FOR LENIN'S "IMPERIALISM"

By E. Varga and L. Mendelsohn

Complete text of Lenin's **Imperialism** with supplementary material 1.60

YOUTH ARSENAL OF FACTS

By Labor Research Association

New pocket handbook for ready reference .25

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

A BOOK OF WORLD IMPORTANCE!

History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Prepared under the supervision of the Central Committee, C.P.S.U.

"The study of the heroic history of the Bolshevik Party arms us with the knowledge of the laws of social development and political struggle, with the knowledge of the driving forces of the revolution.

"The study of the history of the C.P.S.U. strengthens our confidence in the final victory of the great cause of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, the victory of Communism throughout the entire world."

From Introduction to **History of the C.P.S.U.**

"WITH THIS BOOK WE WILL RAISE UP A WHOLE GENERATION SCHOOLED IN THE BEST THOUGHT PRODUCED BY HUMANITY."

Earl Browder, **Theory as a Guide to Action**

364 Pages. Cloth $1.00

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.